

This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

A 402018

GREAT AMERICAN LEGISLATORS


ARTES
VERITAS
SCIENTIA
LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

上
33
.C1

Great American Legislators

SOURCE EXTRACTS

BY

HOWARD W. CALDWELL, A.M.

PROFESSOR OF AMERICAN HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
J. H. MILLER, PUBLISHER
1900

COPYRIGHTED, 1900,
BY
J. H. MILLER.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
	Introduction	v.
I.	Albert Gallatin	1
II.	John Quincy Adams	27
III.	Henry Clay	57
IV.	Daniel Webster	75
V.	John C. Calhoun	99
VI.	Charles Sumner	123
VII.	Stephen A. Douglas	147
VIII.	William H. Seward	171
IX.	Salmon P. Chase	93
X.	James G. Blaine	215

INTRODUCTION

METHODS of teaching history are in process of transformation. With the change in method comes the demand for new books; so if anyone asks the reason for this little collection of sources on American history, the answer is believed to be found in this change. The compiler is pleased to know that these studies have been received with favor by many progressive teachers. He feels that the lack of proper and available material is one reason that the "laboratory method" has not found more ready acceptance in the past by a larger number of teachers. In the belief that this collection will in part supply the demand, it is now sent forth to the school-world in this more permanent form.

In many Normal schools and in some high schools brief reviews are demanded and given. In such cases it seems to the writer to be a waste of time to hurry through some text book, repeating the work that has been done in the grades, in perchance even a less efficient way. It is hoped and believed that the following ten "studies" help to solve the problem of such reviews. A few suggestions are made in regard to the method of handling this material. A note-book should be in the hand of every pupil. It is desirable to have this made up of loose sheets of paper, perforated, so that they may be bound together, or removed and changed in place at the will of the pupil. A cover should be made or purchased in which to keep and preserve these sheets.

The next and most important matter is to bring the students into contact with the original material as often and as completely as possible. For this purpose, of course the "sources" must be accessible, and as far as possible in the hands of every pupil. It should be noted here again that it is not expected that the larger part even of the facts of history can be obtained from these sources, so a good narrative text must be at hand, and in constant use. The "sources" are to be used for the purpose of illustrating how the narrative history was formed; but more especially for the mental training which may be obtained from their use. The same document or illustrative extract should be in the hands of every member of the class that each may have the benefit of the criticism of all.

With the material then in the hands of the class, the first question will be to determine as far as possible its value. To do this necessitates that we find out whether the document is what it purports to be; then to determine whether we have a correct copy of it. Next we must find out who wrote it, and under what circumstances. Finally, the character of the author will come under discussion. Did he have the opportunity to know? Was he able, honest, educated? Was he writing for partisan ends, or did he attempt to tell the exact truth? These are a few of the tests we must apply to our material, if we are to know its real value. Perhaps the most important question of all will be, did the writer know of his own personal knowledge, or did he gain his information from hearsay? After we have determined the

value of our "source," we next proceed to analyze it, and to find out just what the writer meant. Here we must notice the use and meaning of words at the time the document was written, and note any changes at the present time, so that we may get just the idea intended to be conveyed. A series of questions will often greatly help in this analysis. The ones given in the text are only intended to be suggestive, and so may be supplemented by others, or limited by omissions.

The next step will be to classify and arrange our knowledge. In the writer's opinion this is the hardest, as well as the most important, part of the work. A logical arrangement must be insisted on. A careful outline must be prepared, containing a page reference to every point in the notes. It is only by this careful preparation that accuracy in thinking or in writing can ever be secured. When this work is completed, then the last step in the plan can be taken with great ease and facility, for then the whole mind and strength can be concentrated on the composition. The memory under such circumstances is not burdened with carrying all the details. They are indicated in the outline and in the notes to which it refers. It goes without saying that every piece of student work when completed should be tested by comparing it with the best narrative texts, or with the teacher's knowledge.

One final idea should be suggested. Each of these studies covers many years of time. The evolution of the topic has been kept in mind in making the extracts. In working up the material then into papers and

reports, the teacher should see that the pupil has noted and understood the changes and the reasons therefor. For example, if the topic be the "Economic History" of the United States, great pains should be taken to call the attention to the changes in belief in regard to the tariff, or internal improvements. Let every effort be bent to discovering the causes of these changes. If Webster cease to be a free trader, the reason for the change should be found if possible. If the South oppose internal improvements, let the cause be unearthed.

These studies, then, are committed to my fellow teachers in the hope that they may aid them a little in solving the difficult problem of how to get our children to understand their own history, and to get such an understanding in such a way as to make them mentally and morally stronger, that they may be better prepared to meet the exceedingly difficult questions which will confront the coming generation. The writer has no extravagant ideas or expectations in regard to the transforming power of these studies. He simply hopes and believes that they will be found to be an aid.

H. W. C.

ALBERT GALLATIN

Born in Switzerland, 1761. Came to America, 1781. Member of Pennsylvania legislature. Senator of United States, 1794—rejected. Member of House of Representatives, 1794-1801. Secretary of treasury, 1801-1813. Peace commissioner, 1813-1814. Ambassador to France, 1815-1823. Ambassador to court of St. James, 1826-1829. Nominated for Vice-President, 1824—withdrew. Banker last years of life in New York. Died, 1849.

CHAPTER I

ALBERT GALLATIN

THIS year we are to have a series of character studies for our source work. The aim will be to let, as far as possible, each man "give an account of himself." Since the aim is to study men, rather than the history of their times, the extracts chosen will be primarily for that purpose, but incidentally it is hoped and expected that much light will be thrown on the times. In a succeeding number something will be said in regard to method again, but no great amount of space will be taken up with that work. Trusting that some of America's great statesmen will mean more from these studies to the youth of many a school, the series is launched with Albert Gallatin, scholar, statesman, orator, diplomat, and scientist.

Gallatin's connection with American history may be said to begin with this letter:

PASSY, May 24, 1780.

DEAR SON—Messrs. Gallatin and Serres, two young gentlemen of Geneva, of good families and very good characters, having an inclination to see America, if they should arrive in your city I recommend them to your civilities, counsel, and countenance.

I am ever your affectionate father,

B. FRANKLIN.

To Richard Bache, Postmaster General, Philadelphia.

—*Adams' Life of Gallatin, p. 24.*

An extract from the action of the President and Fellows of Harvard College, July 2, 1782, will indicate how Gallatin made his living for a time:

Vote 5. That Mr. Gallatin * * * be permitted to instruct in the French language such of the students as desire it, and who shall obtain permission from their parents or guardians in writing, signified under their hands to the President; which students shall be assessed in their quarter-bills the sums agreed for with Mr. Gallatin for their instruction; and that Mr. Gallatin be allowed the use of the library, a chamber in the college, and commons at the rate paid by the tutors, if he desire. JOSEPH WILLARD, *President.*

—*Adams' Life of Gallatin, p. 42.*

In 1783 when he left Harvard he carried with him the good-will of all, as the following testimonials will show. The President * * * said:

[Mr. Gallatin had] acquitted himself in this department with great reputation. He appears to be well acquainted with letters, and has maintained an unblemished character in the university and in this part of the country.—*Ibid, 43.*

Three years later we find Gallatin in close touch with P. Henry, and Virginia. In a letter of recommendation and introduction Henry says:

* * * I feel it my duty in a peculiar manner to give every possible facility to this gentleman, because his personal character, as well as his present designs, entitle him to the most cordial regards.

P. HENRY, 1785,

—*Ibid., 60.*

Albert Gallatin was married to Sophia Allègre in a runaway match, May 14, 1789.

In his account book appears the following entries:

Ruban de queue, 1-6, Veste blanche, 9, Tailleur, £2, 16s. Souliers de satin, gants, bague £1, 11.6, License minister, £4,4. * * *

The following letter throws some light on one episode in Gallatin's history:

NEW KENT, May 16, 1789.

MY DEAR MAMA—Shall I venture to write you a few lines in apology for my late conduct? And dare I flatter myself that you will attend to them? If so, and you can feel a motherly tenderness for your child who never before wilfully offended you, forgive, dear mother, and generously accept again your poor Sophia, who feels for the uneasiness she is sure she has occasioned you. She deceived you, but it was for her own happiness. Could you then form a wish to destroy the future peace of your child and prevent her being united to the man of her choice? He is perhaps not a very handsome man, but he is possessed of more essential qualities, which I shall not pretend to enumerate, as, coming from me, they might be supposed partial. If, mama, your heart is inclined to forgive, or, if it is not, let me beg you to write to me, as my only anxiety is to know whether I have lost your affection or not. Forgive me, dear mama, as it is all that is wanted to complete the happiness of her who wishes for your happiness and desires to be considered again your dutiful daughter. SOPHIA,

—*Ibid.*, *72*.

She died the following October.

The position of Gallatin during the first days after the constitution was submitted to the people may be gathered from the following resolutions, adopted at a second convention, held at Harrisburg, 1788.

1st. Resolved that in order to prevent a dissolution of the Union, and to secure our liberties and those of our posterity, it is necessary that a revision of the Federal Constitution be obtained in the most speedy manner.

2d. That the safest manner to obtain such a revision will be. * * * , to have a convention

[a second national convention] called as soon as possible; * *.

3d. That in order that the friends to amendments of the Federal Constitution * * may act in concert, * * it is hereby recommended to the several counties in the state to appoint committees, who may correspond one with another and with such similar committees as may be formed in other states.

4th. [A call for a general convention.]

A less radical set of resolutions were adopted; and, as both are in Gallatin's handwriting, we cannot determine whether he changed his views, or was overruled at the conference. The final result was to recommend twelve amendments, similar to those already suggested by Massachusetts and New York, to the constitution.—*Ibid., 78.*

Gallatin has left us an account of his influence in the Pennsylvania legislature and the reasons therefor:

I acquired an extraordinary influence in that body, the more remarkable as I was always in a *party* minority. I was indebted for it to my great industry and to the facility with which I could understand and carry on the current business. The laboring oar was left almost exclusively to me. In the session of 1791-92, I was put on thirty-five committees, prepared all their reports, and drew all their bills. * * *

I failed, though the bill I had introduced passed the House, in my efforts to lay the foundation for a better system of education. Primary education was almost universal in Pennsylvania, but very bad, and the bulk of the schoolmasters incompetent, miserably paid, and held in no consideration. It appeared to me that * * * intermediate academic education was an indispensable preliminary step; and the object of the bill was to establish in each county an academy, allowing to each out of the treasury a sum equal to that raised by taxation in the county for its support. But there was at that time in Pennsylvania a Quaker and a German opposition to every plan of general education. The spirit of internal improvements had not yet been awakened. Still, the first turnpike road in the United

States was that from Philadelphia to Lancaster. * * * This, as well as every temporary improvement in our communications (roads and rivers and preliminary surveys, met, of course, with my warm support. But it was in the fiscal department that I was particularly employed. * * *

The report of the Committee of Ways and Means * * * was entirely prepared by me. * * * I was quite astonished at the general encomiums bestowed upon it, and was not at all aware that I had done so well. It was perspicuous and comprehensive; but I am confident that its true merit, and that which gained me the general confidence, was its being founded in strict justice, without the slightest regard to party feelings or popular prejudices. * * *

It was my constant assiduity to business and the assistance derived from it by many members which enabled the Republican party in the legislature, then a minority on joint ballot, to elect me, and no other but me of that party, senator of the United States.—*Ibid., p. 85–86.*

In 1793 Gallatin prepared the following report:

That they [the committee] are of opinion that slavery is inconsistent with every principle of humanity, justice, and right, and repugnant to the spirit and express letter of the constitution of this commonwealth. * * * [A bill to abolish introduced.]—*Ibid., 86*

In 1792 Gallatin formulated the reasons for the opposition of the western counties of Pennsylvania to the excise tax in these words:

Our peculiar situation renders this duty still more unequal and oppressive to us. Distant from a permanent market and separated from the eastern coast by mountains * * * , we have no means of bringing the produce of our lands to sale, either in grain or in meal. We are therefore distillers through necessity, not choice, that we may comprehend the greatest value in the smallest size and weight. The inhabitants

of the eastern side of the mountains can dispose of their grain without the additional labor of distillation at a higher price than we can after we have bestowed that labor upon it. Yet, with this additional labor, we must also pay a high duty, from which they are exempted, because we have no means of selling our surplus produce but in a distilled state.

Another circumstance which renders this duty ruinous to us is our scarcity of cash. Our commerce is not, as on the eastern coast, carried on so much by absolute sale as by barter, and we believe it to be a fact that there is not among us a quantity of circulating cash sufficient for the payment of this duty alone. We are not accustomed to complain without reason, * * * .—*Ibid., p. 88.*

In a letter to a friend written in 1792, he says:

* * * . We have a plan before us, which I brought forward, to establish a school and library in each county, each county to receive £1,000 for buildings and beginning a library, and from £75 to £150 a year, according to its size, to pay at least in part a teacher of the English language and one of the elements of of mathematics, geography, and history, * * * , it is meant as a preparatory step to township schools, * * * .—*Ibid., p. 90.*

In a petition drafted by Gallatin to the legislature of Pennsylvania, from the western counties of Pennsylvania, we find the following language:

That your petitioners have been greatly alarmed by a law of Congress which imposes a duty on spirituous liquors distilled from produce of the United States. To us that act appears unequal in its operation and immoral in its effects. Unequal in its operation, as a duty laid on the common drink of a nation, instead of taxing the citizens in proportion to their property, falls as heavy on the poorest class as on the rich; immoral in its effect, because the amount of the duty, chiefly resting on the oath of the payer, offers, at the expense of the honest part of the community, a pres-

sure to perjury and fraud. Your petitioners also consider this law as dangerous to liberty; * * * —*Writings Gallatin, Vol. I., pp. 3-4.*

Extracts from a letter to Miss Nicholson a few months before their marriage, August 25, 1793:

* * * Well, my charming patriot, why do you write to me about politics? * * * I believe that, except a very few intemperate, unthinking, or wicked men, no American wishes to see his country involved in war. As to myself, I think every war except a defensive one to be unjustifiable. As to the present cause of France, although I think they have been guilty of many excesses, * * * and that in their present temper they are not likely to have a very good government within any short time, yet I firmly believe their cause to be that of mankind against tyrants, and, at all events, that no foreign nation has a right to dictate a government to them. So far, I think, we are interested in their success, and as to our political situation they are certainly the only real allies we have yet had. * * * Upon the whole, I think that unless France or England attach us we shall have no war. * * * Please to remember that my politics are only for you. Except in my public character I do not like to speak on the subject, although I believe you will agree with me that I have no reason to be ashamed of my sentiments; but moderation is not fashionable just now.

Again, December 15, 1793, just after their marriage, he writes:

I am happy to see that you are a tolerable democrat, and, at the same time, a moderate one. I trust that our parties at this critical juncture will, as far as possible, forget old animosities, and show, at least to the foreign powers who hate us, that we will be unanimous whenever the protection and defense of our country require it.—*Adams' Life of Gallatin, pp. 103-104, 112.*

The following anecdote illustrates very well the way much history is written, as well as gives us a good insight into the character of Gallatin for straightforward honesty. Brackenridge, in his "Incidents of the Whiskey Rebellion," relates the incident as follows:

Mr. Gallatin supported the necessity of the resolution with a view to the establishment of the laws, and the conservation of the peace, though he d d not venture to touch on the resistance to the marshal, or the expulsion of the proscribed, yet he strongly arraigned the destruction of property; the burning of the barn of Kirkpatrick, for instance. "What?" said a fiery fellow in the committee, "do you blame that?" The secretary, [Gallatin] found himself embarrased; he paused for a moment. "If you had burned him in it" said he "it m'ght have been something; but the barn had done no harm." "Ay, Ay," said the man, "that is right enough." I admired the presence of mind of Gallatin, and give the incident as a proof of the delicacy necessary to manage the people on that occasion.

Mr. Gallatin has written on the margin of the volume containing this account these words:

Totally false. It is what B. would have said in my place. The fellow said: "It was well done." I replied instantly: "No; it was not well done," and I continued to deprecate in the most forcible terms every act of violence. For I had quoted the burning of this house as one of the worst.—*Adams' Life of Gallatin, p. 133.*

April 22, 1795, Gallatin writes to his wife from New York, in part, as follows:

The more I see of this state the better I like Pennsylvania. It may be prejudice, or habit, or whatever you please, but there are some things in the Western country which contribute to my happiness, and which I do not find here. Among other things which displease me here I may mention, in the first place, *family influence.* In Pennsylvania * * * from the suburbs of Philadelphia to the banks of the Ohio, I do not know a single family that has any extensive influence. An equal distribution of property has rendered every individual independent, and there is amongst us true and real equality. * * * In a word * * * as I am poor, I like a country where no person is very rich. * * *.—*Ibid., p. 146-47.*

The following may not throw much light on Gallatin, but it gives us his opinion of the con-

ditions of 1795. He is commenting on the Whiskey Rebellion trials:

* * * Brackinridge says he would always choose a jury of Quakers, or at least Episcopalians, in all common cases, such as murder, etc., but in every possible case of insurrection, rebellion, and treason, give him Presbyterians on the jury by all means. I believe there is at least as much truth as wit in the saying. * * *.—*Ibid, p. 150.*

Mr. Gallatin has made an estimate of his own services in Congress from which a few extracts may be made that will throw much light on the man and his works. He says:

The first great debate in which we were engaged was that on the British treaty; and my speech, or rather two speeches, on the constitutional powers of the House, * * * were, whether I was right or wrong, universally considered as the best on either side. I think that of Mr. Madison superior and more comprehensive, but for this very reason (comprehensiveness) less impressive than mine. Griswold's reply was thought the best; in my opinion it was that of Goodrich, * * *, both, however, were second-rate. The most brilliant and eloquent speech was undoubtedly that of Mr. Ames; * * *.

It is certainly a subject of self-gratulation that I should have been allowed to take the lead [in Congress] with such co-adjutors as Madison, Giles, Livingston, and Nicholas, * * * and that I was able to contend on equal terms with the host of talents collected in the Federal party—Griswold, Bayard, Harper, Goodrich, Otis, Smith, Sitgreans, Dana, and even J. Marshall. Yet I was destitute of eloquence, and had to surmount the great obstacle of speaking in a foreign language, with a very bad pronunciation. My advantages consisted in laborious investigation, habits of analysis, thorough knowledge of the subject under discussion, and more extensive general information, due to an excellent early education, to which I think I may add quickness of apprehension and a sound judgment.

* * * * * * * * * * *

The principal questions in which I was engaged related to constitutional construction or to the finances. * * * The Financial department in the House was quite vacant, so far, at least, as the opposition [the Republicans] was concerned; and having made myself complete master of the subject, and occupied that field almost exclusively, it is not astonishing that my views should have been adopted by the Republican party and been acted upon when they came into power.—*Adams' Life of Gallatin, pp. 155-157.*

January 24, 1797, Gallatin writes to his wife concerning a dinner with President Washington in the following words:

He [Washington] looked, I thought, more than usually grave, cool, and reserved. Mrs. W. inquired about you, so that you may suppose yourself still in the good graces of our most gracious queen, who, by the by, continues to be a very good-natured and amiable woman. Not so her husband, in your husband's humble opinion; but that between you and me, for I hate treason, and you know that it would be less sacrilegious to carry arms against our nation than to refuse singing to the tune of the best and greatest of men * * *.—*Adams' Life of Gallatin, p. 182.*

A few days later he writes again concerning the political conditions of the times in this rather gloomy way:

* * * Your husband was not formed for the bustles of a political life in a stormy season. Conscious of the purity of my motives, and (shall I add when I write to my bosom friend) conscious of my own strength, I may resist the tempest with becoming firmness, but happiness dwells not there. * * * I feel disgusted at the mean artifices which have so long been successfully employed in order to pervert public opinion, and I anticipate with gloomy apprehension the fatal consequences to our independence as a nation and to our internal union which must follow the folly or wickedness of those who have directed our public measures.—*Ibid., p. 182 s.*

Again he writes:

Your papa has not yet answered my last political letter. I am afraid he thinks me too moderate and believes I am going to trim. But moderation and firmness have ever been and ever will be my motto.—*Ibid., p. 184.*

February 23, 1798, Gallatin writes to his wife concerning the Washington birthday ball in this way:

* Do you want to know the fashionable news of the day? The President of the United States has written in answer to the managers of the ball in honor of G. Washington's birthday, that he took the earliest opportunity of informing them that he *declined* going. The court is in a prodigious uproar about that important event. The ministers and their wives do not know how to act upon the occasion; the friends of the old court say it is dreadful, a monstrous insult to the late president; * * * A most powerful battery was opened against me to induce me to go to the said ball; it would be remarked; it would look well; it would show that we democrats, and I specially, felt no reluctance in showing my respect to the person of Mr. Washington, but that our objections to levees and to birthday balls applied only to its being a Presidential, anti-republican establishment, and that we were only afraid of its being made a precedent; and then it would mortify Mr. Adams and please Mr. Washington. All those arguments will appear very weak to you when on paper, but they were urged by a fine lady, by Mrs. Law, and when supported by her handsome black eyes they appeared very formidable. * * *.—*Ibid., 194.*

He wrote to Maria Nicholson on July 10, 1798, concerning the press, in terms that may well be considered by us:

* * * I see the persecutions of the printers are going on. I do not admire much the manner in which the new editor of the *Time-Piece* conducts his paper. Cool discussion and fair statements of facts are the only proper modes of conveying truth and disseminating sound principles. Let squibs and virulent

paragraphs be the exclusive privilege of Fenno, Porcupine & Co., and let the papers which really are intended to support republicanism unite candor and moderation to unconquerable firmness. Pieces may be written in an animated style without offending decency. * * *—*Adams' Life of Gallatin, p. 196.*

In 1799 he again gives us an insight into his own conception of himself. He writes to his wife:

* * * I begin to think that one of the causes of my opposition to a great extension of executive power is that constitutional indolence which, notwithstanding some share of activity of mind, makes me more fit to think than to act. I believe I am well calculated to judge and to determine what course ought to be followed either in private or public business. But I must have executive officers who will consult me and act for me. * * *—*Adams' Life of Gallatin, p. 226.*

In 1800, in commenting on the sinking fund plan of paying national debts, Gallatin showed that he at that time recognized its fallacy, although it was not till many years later that his view was admitted to be correct. He says in part:

* * * I know but one way that a nation has of paying her debts, and that is precisely the same which individuals practice. Spend *less* than you receive, and you may then apply the surplus of your receipts to the discharge of your debts. But if you spend more than you receive, you may have recourse to sinking funds, you may modify them as you please. You may render your accounts extremely complex, you may give a scientific appearance to additions and subtractions, you must still necessarily increase your debt. If you spend more than you receive, the difference must be supplied by loans; and if out of these receipts you have set a sum apart to pay your debts, * * * you must borrow so much in order to meet your expenditures. If your revenue is nine millions of dollars, and your expenditures fourteen, you must borrow,

you must create a new debt of five millions. But if two millions of that revenue are, under the name of a sinking fund, applicable to the payment of the principal of an old debt, and pledged for it, then the portion of your revenue applicable to discharging your current expenditures of fourteen millions is reduced to seven millions; and instead of borrowing five millions you must borrow seven; you create a new debt of seven millions, and you pay an old debt of two. It is still the same increase of five millions of debt. * * *—*Annals of Congress.*

Gallatin's ideas in regard to the work of the new administration, Jefferson's, may be gathered from a letter of November 16, 1801. He says:

If we cannot * * * pay the debt at the rate proposed and support the establishments on the proposed plans, one of three things must be done: either to continue the internal taxes, or to reduce the expenditure still more, or to discharge the debt with less rapidity. The last recourse is to me the most objectionable, not only because I am firmly of the opinion that if the present administration and Congress do not take the most effective measures for that object, the debt will be entailed on us and the ensuing generations, together with all the systems which support it and which it supports, * * *.

On the other hand, if this administration shall not reduce taxes, they never will be permanently reduced. To strike at the root of the evil, and avert the danger of increasing taxes, encroaching government, temptations to offensive wars, etc., nothing can be more effectual than a repeal of *all* internal taxes; * * * *. I agree most fully with you that pretended tax-preparations, treasurer-preparations, and army-preparations against contingent wars tend only to encourage wars. If the United States shall unavoidably be drawn into war, the people will submit to any necessary tax, * * *.—*Adams' Life of Gallatin, pp. 270-71.*

In regard to the policy he would have pursued in regard to appointment to and removal

from office, the following extract will give a general idea:

[There is] but one sentiment I wish to communicate; it is that the door of the office be no longer shut against any man merely on account of his political opinion, but that whether he shall differ or not from those avowed by you or by myself, integrity and capacity suitable to the station be the only qualifications that shall direct our choice.

Permit me, since I have touched this topic, to add that whilst freedom of opinion and freedom of suffrage at public elections are considered by the president as unprescriptible rights which, possessing as citizens, you cannot have lost by becoming public officers, he will regard any exercise of official influence to restrain or control the same right in others as injurious to that part of the public administration which is confided to your care, and practically destructive of the fundamental principles of a republican constitution.—*Ibid., pp. 278-79.*

Gallatin from Washington to his wife, 1802:

* * * Indeed, dinners of a political cast cannot, in the present state of parties, be very cheerful unless confined to one party. * * * I had another cause which damped my spirits. We were in an enclosure, * * * and some marines were placed as sentries to prevent intrusion; * * *. The very sight of a bayonet to preserve order amongst citizens rouses my indignation, and you may judge of my feelings when I tell you that one of the sentries actually stabbed a mechanic who abused him because he had been ordered away. The bayonet went six inches in his body and close to his heart. He is not dead, but still in great danger, and the marine in jail. Such are the effects of what is called discipline in times of peace. The distribution of one little army to distant garrisons where hardly any other inhabitant is to be found is the most eligible arrangement of that perhaps necessary evil that can be contrived. But I never want to see the face of one in our cities and intermixed with the people.

* * * * * * * * * *

Nothing but the hope of seeing you soon has kept in any degree my spirits from sinking; whether in the plains or over the hills, whether in city or in retreat, I cannot live without you. It is trifling with that share of happiness which Providence permits us to enjoy to be forever again and again parted. I am now good for nothing but for you, and good for nothing without you. You will say that anyhow I am not good for much; that may be, but such as I am, you are mine, and you are my comfort, my joy, and the darling of my soul. Now do not go and show this to Maria [Mrs. Gallatin's sister]; not that I am ashamed of it, for I glory in my love for you; but she will think my expressing myself that way very foolish, and I am afraid of her.—*Life, pp. 304-5.*

A letter of Gallatin's to Jefferson, written in 1803, will indicate his ideas in regard to the powers of the national government:

To me it would appear, 1st, That the United States as a nation have an inherent right to acquire territory.

2d. That whenever that acquisition is by treaty, the same constituted authorities in whom the treaty making power is vested have a constitutional right to sanction the acquisition.

3d. That whenever the territory has been acquired, Congress have the power either of admitting into the Union as a state, or of annexing to a state with the consent of that state, or of making regulations for the government of such territory.—*Adams' Life of Gallatin, p. 320.*

That Gallatin was not unaffected by the attack on the "Chesapeake," and the course of France and England toward the United States stands forth plainly in the following extracts:

The attack of the British on the Chesapeake and their subsequent conduct near Norfolk has much irritated every one here, and all are anxious to learn what the president intends to do. * * * If war must be we ought to prosecute it with the same zeal that we have endeavored to preserve peace, and by great exertions convince the enemy that it is not from fear

or cowardice that we dread it. But peace, if we can have it, is always best for us, and if the Executive can get justice done and preserve it, that executive will deserve the thanks of every democrat in the Union.—*Life, p. 360.*

July 17, 1807, he writes to his brother-in-law, J. H. Nicholson, concerning the same subject:

* * * . With you I believe that war is inevitable, and there can be but one opinion on the question whether the claims of the parties prior to the attack on the Chesapeake should be a subject of discussion. * * *

I feel no apprehension of the immediate result. We will be poorer, both as a nation and as a government; our debt and taxes will increase, and our progress in every respect be interrupted. But all those evils are not only not to be put into competition with the independence and honor of the nation. They are, moreover, temporary, and very few years of peace will obliterate their effects. Nor do I know whether the awakening of nobler feelings and habits than avarice and luxury might not be necessary to prevent our degenerating, like the Hollanders, into a nation of mere calculators. In fact, the greatest mischiefs which I apprehend from the war are the necessary increase of the executive power and influence, the speculation of contractors and jobbers, and the introduction of permanent military and naval establishments * * * .—*Adams' Life of Gallatin, pp. 361-62.*

The spirit of the English Orders in Council which finally, together with the Decrees of Napoleon, led to the Embargo policy of Jefferson, may be seen in this letter of Spencer Perceval, a member of the English government. He says:

The short principle is that trade in British produce and manufactures, and trade either from a British port or with a British destination, is to be protected as much as possible. For this purpose all the countries where French influence prevails to exclude the British flag

shall have no trade but to or from this country or from its allies. All other countries, the few that remain strictly neutral (* * *) cannot trade but through this being done as an ally with any of the countries connected with France. If, therefore, we can accomplish our purpose, it will come to this, that either those countries will have no trade, or they must be content to accept it through us, * * *.

Jefferson was in favor of having no trade, rather than accept it on such conditions, hence he recommended the Embargo. How Gallatin thought on the subject we may see from the following extracts:

In every point of view, privations, sufferings, revenue, effect on the enemy, politics at home, etc., I prefer war to a permanent embargo. Governmental prohibitions do always more mischief than had been calculated; and it is not without much hesitation that a statesman should hazard to regulate the concerns of individuals as if he could do it better than themselves. —*Ibid., p. 366.*

A few months later, July 29, 1808, after the Embargo policy had been in force for some time, Gallatin again wrote in these terms:

I am perfectly satisfied that if the embargo must be persisted in any longer, two principles must necessarily be adopted in order to make it sufficient; 1st, That not a single vessel shall be permitted to move without the special permission of the Executive; 2d, That the collectors be invested with the general power of seizing property anywhere * * *. I am sensible that such arbitrary powers are equally dangerous and odious, * * *.

That in the present situation of the world every effort should be attempted to preserve the peace of this nation cannot be doubted. But if the criminal party rage of Federalists and Tories shall have so far succeeded as to defeat our endeavors to attain that object by the only measure [Embargo] that could possibly have affected it, we must submit and prepare for war. * * *.—*Ibid, pp. 370-71.*

A letter of November 8, 1809, to Jefferson, gives us an insight into the aims of Gallatin as Secretary of the Treasury. In part he says:

* * * The reduction of the public debt was certainly the principal object in bringing me into office, and our success in that respect has been due both to the joint and continuous efforts of the several branches of government and to the prosperous situation of the country. * * *—*Adams' Life, p. 409.*

Gallatin writes to Jefferson, March 10, 1812, in regard to the war conditions, in a few brief sentences as follows:

* * * You have seen from your retreat that our hopes and endeavors to preserve peace during the present European contest have at last been frustrated. I am satisfied that domestic faction has prevented that happy result. But I hope, nevertheless, that our internal enemies and the ambitious intriguers who still attempt to disunite will ultimately be equally disappointed. I rely with great confidence on the good sense of the mass of the people to support their own government in an unavoidable war, and to check the disordinate ambition of individuals. * * * With respect to the war, it is my wish * * * that the evils * * * be limited to its duration, and that at its end the United States may be burthened with the smallest possible quantity of debt, perpetual taxation, military establishments, and other corrupting or anti-republican habits or institution. —*Adams' Life, pp. 455-456.*

May 5, 1813, he writes to J. W. Nicholson concerning the war and the need of peace. He says:

* * * Peace, at all times desirable, is much more so for two reasons: 1, The great incapacity for conducting the war; * * * 2, The want of union, or, rather, open hostility to the war and to the Union, which, however disgraceful to the parties concerned, and to the national character, is not less formidable. * * * Finally, provided we can ob-

tain security with respect to impressments, peace will give us everything we want. Taught by experience we will apply a part of our resources to such naval preparations and organization of the public forces as will within less than five years place us in a commanding situation. * * * To keep down the Tory faction at home and ultimately to secure in an effectual manner our national rights against England, peace is equally necessary. * * * —*Ibid., pp. 482-83.*

June 20, Gallatin had an interview with the Emperor Alexander in London. Of it he writes:

His friendly dispositions toward the United States are unimpaired. He earnestly wishes that peace may be made between them and England; but he does not give or seem to entertain any hope that he can on that subject be of any service. * * * England will not admit a third party to interfere in her disputes with you * * *.—*Ibid., 514.*

June 13, he wrote of the conditions:

Whatever may be the object and duration of the war, America must rely on her resources alone. From Europe no assistance can for some time be expected. * * * Above all, there is nowhere any navy in existence, and years of peace must elapse before the means of resisting with effect the sea-power of Great Britain can be created, * * * and the most favorable times of peace that can be expected are the status ante-bellum, and a postponement of the questions of blockades, impressments, and all other points which in time of European peace are not particularly injurious; * * *.—*Writings I., p. 628.*

His view of the effects of the war may be gathered from a letter to Matthew Lyon, of May 7, 1816:

* * * The war has been productive of evil and good, but I think the good preponderates. Independent of the loss of lives and of the losses in property by individuals, the war has laid the foundation of

permanent taxes and military establishments which the Republicans had deemed unfavorable to the happiness and free institutions of the country. But under our former system we were becoming too selfish, too much attached exclusively to the acquisition of wealth, above all, too much confined in our political feelings to local and state objects. The war has renewed and reinstated the national feelings and character which the Revolution had given, and which were daily lessened. The people have now more general objects of attachment with which their pride and political opinions are connected. They are more American; they feel and act more as a nation, and I hope that the permanency of the Union is thereby better secured. * * *—*Writings, I., p. 700.*

He writes from Paris, July 17, 1817, in a tone that shows the change in Europe concerning America:

* * * The growing prosperity of the United States is an object of admiration for all the friends of liberty in Europe, a reproach on almost all the European governments. At no period has America stood on higher ground abroad than now. * * *

I thirst for America, and I hope that the time is not distant when I may again see her shores and enjoy the blessings which are found only there. * * * [He remained as minister in France, however, till 1823] —*Adams' Life of Gallatin, p. 565.*

Gallatin to his wife, from Washington, January 24, 1824:

* * * Mr. Crawford is mending slowly. His friends are not perfectly easy about his final recovery, and Early adduced this to me as a reason why I should be made Vice President. My answer was that I did not want the office, and would dislike to be proposed and not elected.—*Adams' Life of Gallatin, p. 594.*

After the election of 1824 Gallatin's name was suggested for a cabinet position. In that connection, he writes:

As to my accepting the Treasury Department, it is out of the question [too much labor] * * *

But even with respect to the Department of State, for which I am better calculated than any other, and as fit as any other person, it appears to me, * * * it would not be proper for me to become a member of it [the cabinet]. This is much strengthened by the surmises to which Mr. Clay's conduct has given birth, and by the circumstance of his accepting one of the Departments. I must, and will at all events, remain above the reach of suspicion.—*Ibid., p. 608.*

About 1830 Gallatin entered politics again in so far as taking part in public discussions may be called entering politics. He wrote in favor of the bank, and against protection. In regard to his mental habits, he says:

I can lay no claim to either originality of thinking or felicity of expression. If I have met with any success either in public bodies, as an executive officer, or in foreign negotiations, it has been exclusively through a patient and most thorough investigation of all the attainable facts, and a cautious application of these to the questions under discussion; * * *.—*Adams' Life of Gallatin, p. 637.*

Henry Adams has given this summary of the life of Gallatin:

Under these pleasant conditions, Mr. Gallatin's active mind turned to those scientific pursuits for which it was so well fitted and in which it took so much delight. Perhaps one might not wander far from the truth if one added that these pursuits were, on the whole, his most permanent claim to distinction. The first debater and parliamentarian of his day, his fame as a leader of Congress has long since ceased to give an echo, and his most brilliant speeches are hardly known even by name to the orators of the present generation. The first of all American financiers, his theories, his methods, and his achievements as secretary of the treasury are as completely forgotten by politicians as his speeches in Congress. First among the diplomatists of his time, his reputation as a diplomat has passed out of men's minds. First as a writer and an authority on political economy in America, very few economists can now re-

member the titles of his writings or the consequences of his action. But he was the father of American ethnology, and there has been no time since his death when the little band of his followers have forgotten him. * * * . Thus it was he who first established the linguistic groups of the North American Indians on a large scale, and made the first ethnographical map of North America which had real merit. * * * .—*Adams' Life of Gallatin, pp. 643–44.*

In 1833 he writes a long letter to his friend, John Badollet, in which occurs this sentence:

The present aspect of our national politics is extremely discouraging; yet, having hitherto always seen the good sense of this nation ultimately prevail against the excesses of party spirit, and the still more dangerous efforts of disappointed ambition, I do not despair.—*Ibid., p. 648.*

To Badollet he again writes in 1836:

The energy of this nation is not to be controlled; it is at present exclusively applied to the acquisition of wealth and to improvements of stupendous magnitude, * * *. The apparent prosperity and the progress of cultivation, population, commerce, and improvement are beyond expectation. But it seems to me as if general demoralization was the consequence; and I would have preferred a gradual, slow, and more secure progress. I am, however, an old man, and the young generation has a right to govern itself * * *.—*Ibid, p. 653.*

Miss Martineau has left us an account of an interview of 1834 with Gallatin that is worthy to be quoted entire. However, space forbids, and only some extracts may be taken.

Mr. Gallatin called. Old man. Began his career in 1787. Has been three times in England. Twice as minister. Found George IV. a cipher * * * William IV. silly as duke of Clarence. Gallatin would have the president a cipher, too, if he could, *i. e.*, would have him *annual*, so that all would be done by the ministers. * * *. The office was made for the

man—Washington—who was *wanted* (as well as fit) to reconcile all parties. Bad office, but well filled till now. Too much power for one man: therefore it fills all men's thoughts to the detriment of better things. Jackson "a pugnacious animal." * * *.

New Englanders the best people, perhaps, in the world. Prejudiced, but able, honest, and homogeneous, compound elsewhere. * * *.

All great changes have been effected by the Democratic party, from the first up to the universal suffrage, which practically exists.

* * * * * * * * * * *

Would have no United States Bank. Would have free banking as soon as practicable. It cannot be yet. Thinks Jackson all wrong about the bank, but has changed his opinions as to its powers. It has no political powers, but prodigious commercial. If the bank be not necessary, better avoid allowing this power. Bank has not overpapered this country.

Gallatin is tall, bald, toothless, speaks with burr, looks venerable and courteous. Opened out and apologized for his full communication. Kissed my hand.—*Adams' Life of Gallatin, pp. 650-51.*

He opposed the annexation of Texas, the war with Mexico, and the extension of slavery. From 1844 to 1848 he worked with the greatest energy in these directions. Born in 1761, he died in 1849, but as late as 1848 he writes concerning his work to secure peace with Mexico:

I write with great difficulty, and I become exhausted when I work more than four or five hours per day. Ever since the end of October all my faculties, impaired as they are, were absorbed in one subject; not only my faculties, but I may say all my feelings; I thought of nothing else; * * * I postponed everything else, * * * even answering the letters which did not absolutely require immediate attention.—*Writings I., p. 569.*

QUESTIONS.

(1) What was Gallatin's native country? (2) From what class did he come? (3) Was he aristocratic or

democratic himself? (4) What can be said of Gallatin's education? (5) What of his interest in education? (6) In what states do you find Gallatin lived? (7) What did Gallatin spend money for, for his marriage? (8) From the letter given what do you think of his first wife? (9) What the nature of his home life after his second marriage?

(1) Name the public positions that Gallatin held. (2) Make a list of his political views. (3) What can you say of the success of his statesmanship? (4) What arguments were set forth by the people of western Pennsylvania against the excise tax? (5) How did Gallatin regard the French Revolution? (6) What was the error in Mr. Breckenridge's account of the "Whiskey Insurrection"? (7) Why did Gallatin like Pennsylvania better than New York? (8) Do you agree with him in principle? (9) Why did Breckenridge wish to choose juries in the way he suggests?

(1) What was Gallatin's place in national politics? (2) Why was he so strong a leader? (3) Have our most successful statesmen had the same quality in general? (4) What did Gallatin think of the forms and ceremonies of Washington life? (5) How does he criticise President Washington? (6) How did Gallatin propose to pay the national debt? (7) Find out what you can of the "Sinking fund" theory. (8) What were Gallatin's essential ideas in managing the Treasury Department? (9) Was he a "spoilsman"? (10) What would Gallatin say, if living now, in regard to the right to annex Cuba, etc.?

(1) What did Gallatin think of war? (2) How did he regard the war of 1812? (3) Discuss his views regarding an embargo. (4) Find out what you can of an embargo policy. (5) Was the war of 1812 well managed? (6) What did he think of the Federalists? (7) What name did he give them? (8) Did he like America or Europe best? Why? (9) Did he care for office? (10) For what work in politics did he believe himself best fitted? (11) What qualities made him so successful? (12) What American characteristic did he think the most dominant? (13) What do you learn from Miss Martineau's interview of Gallatin's views?

(1) Name Gallatin's dominant characteristics as you

gather them from these extracts. (2) Write a life of Gallatin from this material. (3) Do you admire him or not? Why your answer?

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS

Born at Braintree, Mass., 1767. American Ambassador in Holland, 1797-1801. Senator, 1803-1808. Peace commissioner, 1813-1815. Minister to England, 1815-1817. Secretary of state, 1817-1825. President, 1825-1829. Candidate for reelection, 1828—defeated. Member of House of Representatives, 1832-1848. Died, 1848.

CHAPTER II

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS

ONE of the few really learned legislators in American history is presented in this study. Every opportunity almost that could in any way tend to prepare him for this work was his. As a boy with his father he became familiar with Europe and its statesmen. His youthful years were passed in the midst of diplomats, and at an extremely early age he became one of the foreign ministers of his country. At home he was senator, secretary of state, president, and congressman.

But during all the years of his public life he was ever the hard and persistent student. System in everything characterizes his methods. The result was that before his death he had accumulated a mass of information that was almost phenomenal. His knowledge of history, especially of his own country, was deep and minute. Adams had some faults of disposition that detracted from his lovableness, but when all has been said, he yet remains one of the great characters in our country's history.

Mr. F. G. Franklin, instructor in American history in the University, has prepared the extracts for this number. They tell much of the life, and indicate clearly the thought, of Adams

on most of the great questions of his day. The necessity of cutting out many chosen passages, in order to reduce the article to its space limits, will explain some gaps in this number as well as in the preceding, and I doubt not in many of the succeeding numbers.

Parts of letters to his father and to his mother show us the boy first at his home, and then at a school in France:

BRAINTREE, June the 2nd, 1777.

DEAR SIR,—I love to receive letters very well; much better than I love to write them. I make but a poor figure at composition, my head is much too fickle, my thoughts are running after birds eggs play and trifles, till I get vexed with myself. Mamma has a troublesome task to keep me steady, and I own I am ashamed of myself. * * * I wish, Sir, you would give me some instructions, with regard to my time, & advise me how to proportion my Studies & my Play, in writing, & I will keep them by me, & endeavor to follow them.

PASSY, September the 27th, 1778.

HONOURED MAMMA,—My Pappa enjoins it upon me to keep a journal, or a diary of the Events that happen to me, and of objects that I see, and of Characters that I converse with from day to day; and altho. I am convinced of the utility, importance & necessity of this Exercise, yet I have not patience and perseverance enough to do it so Constantly as I ought. My Pappa, who takes a great deal of Pains to put me in the right way, has also advised me to Preserve copies of all my letters, & has given me a Convenient Blank Book for this end; and altho I shall have the mortification a few years hence to read a great deal of my Childish nonsense, yet I shall have the Pleasure and advantage of Remarking the several steps by which I shall have advanced in taste judgment and knowledge. A journal Book & a letter Book of a Lad of Eleven years old Can not be expected to contain much of Science, Litterature, arts, wisdom, or wit, yet it may serve to perpetuate many observations that I may make, & may

hereafter help me to recollect both persons & things . . . *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams, I, 7-9.*

Washington wrote of him in 1797:

. . . I give it as my decided opinion that Mr. Adams is the most valuable public character we have aboard, and there remains no doubt in my mind that he will prove himself to be the ablest of our diplomatic corps.—*Ibid., 194.*

The following account of his life in Holland (July, 1796) shows how he became so valuable:

The reading of the month has carried me through Luzac's Richesse de la Hollande, and the Traité Général de Commerce; . . . the Life of Dumouriez, Garat's Memoirs, and Pratt's Gleanings. Of all these books I have made mention, and some slight observations at the time of finishing, and also of Pitt's translation of the Aeneid, Rowe's Lucan, which I have gone through, and Garth's compilation of the Metamorphoses, which I have not yet finished. To improve in the Dutch Language I have usually translated a page every day; and after going thus through the Constitution of the National Assembly, which is now in session, I took the Introduction to Rendorp's Memoirs. I shall give the preference to all interesting state papers; because I send the translations to the Secretary of State, and thus answer two good purposes at once. My progress in Italian is slow, and I can only translate two or three stanzas of Tasso at a time. The language itself is enchanting, but, with no opportunity to speak or hear it spoken, my advances are very small, and, with my other occupations, I may perhaps grow tired of that. To keep alive my Latin, I have begun to translate a page of Tacitus every day, and am going through the life of Agricola, which in the year 1784, at this place, I translated into French. . . . My other writing is principally confined to writing and answering letters, or to the journal.—*Ibid., 176-7.*

While in London he wrote in his diary for July 26, 1797:

At nine this morning . . . I was married to

Louisa Catharine Johnson, the second daughter of Joshua and Catharine Johnson, by Mr. Hewlett.—*Ibid., 199.*

Both lived to celebrate in Quincy, Mass., the semi-centennial of this event.

The political revolution of 1800, bringing into power Jefferson and the Republican party, interrupted John Quincy Adams's diplomatic career abroad. January 28, 1802, he wrote:

I feel strong temptation and have great provocation to plunge into political controversy. But I hope to preserve myself from it by the considerations which have led me to the resolution of renouncing. A politician in this country must be the man of a party. I would fain be the man of my whole country."—*Ibid., 249.*

In the diary, October 21, 1803, he wrote:

At eleven this morning I took my seat in the Senate of the United States.

The following extracts from his diary reveal the character and views of Mr. Adams at this period:

I have already seen enough to ascertain that no amendments of my proposing will obtain in the Senate as now filled.—*Ibid., 270.*

Unanimous consent was necessary [for declaring war with Morocco] and I alone objected. My principle was, that a declaration of war was the last thing in the world to make with *unusual* precipitation.—*Ibid., 273.*

The country is so totally given up to the spirit of party, that not to follow blindfold the one or the other is an inexpiable offence.—*Ibid., 282.*

The cooperation of the Senate in all appointments is at present a mere formality, and a very disgusting formality.—*Ibid., 320.*

In public affairs, it appears to me, there is no quality more useful and important than good humor, because it operates continually to soften the asperities that are continually rising in the collisions of adverse interests and opinions. . . .—*Ibid., 377.*

My political prospects continue declining. [January 1, 1806.]—*Ibid., 380.*

Feeble and insignificant as my influence upon the counsels of the nation is, I feel a load of responsibility weighing upon me to the utmost I can bear. Honest intention and sincerity must be my only substitute for more efficacious powers.—*Ibid., 395.*

Constitutional difficulties never will stand in the way of a majority . . . even in so select a body as the Senate of the United States, a mere variation of phrase will contrive a loophole to creep from the most barefaced usurpation of power.—*Ibid., 417.*

In the afternoon I was installed as Boylston Professc. of Rhetoric and Oratory [at Harvard, June 12, 1806].—*Ibid., 441.*

My defects of elocution are incurable, and amidst so many better speakers, when the debates are to be reported, I never speak without mortification. The process of reasoning in my mind is too *slow* for uninterrupted articulation. My thoughts arise at first confused, and require *time* to shape into a succession of sentences. Hence the transition from thought to thought is awkward and inelegant, and expression often fails me to accomplish a sentence commenced; so that I often begin a thought with spirit and finish it with nonsense. The chain of my argument often escapes me, and when lost can seldom be retrieved. I then finish as I can, without producing half the arguments I proposed before I began to speak. These faults would be so overpowering that I should sink into perpetual silence, from mere impotence, were it not that sometimes in the ardor of debate, when my feelings are wound up to a high tone, elocution pours itself along with unusual rapidity, and I have passages which would not shame a good speaker: this is the only thing that makes me tolerable to others or to myself.—*Ibid., 445.*

[December 31, 1807.] My general consideration among my fellow-citizens, though not marked by any new public testimonial in the course of the year, has been to my observation apparently rising. During the present session of the Senate my standing in that body has been singular—apparently so distinguished as to

have excited jealousies, with little more real influence than heretofore. . . . On most of the great national questions now under discussion, my sense of duty leads me to support the administration, and I find myself of course in opposition to the federalists in gen eral.—*Ibid.*, *497*.

I fully opened to him [Quincy] my motives for supporting the administration at this crisis [danger of war with England], and my sense of the danger which a spirit of opposition is bringing upon the *Union*. I told him where that opposition in case of war must in its nature end—either in a *civil war*, or in a dissolution of the Union, with the Atlantic States in subserviency to Great Britain. That to resist this I was ready, if necessary, to sacrifice everything I have in life, and even life itself.—*Ibid.*, *510*.

The following entry (June 8, 1808) will mark the close of this period:

I found on going into State Street, that Mr. Wheaton's Anti-embargo resolutions were yesterday adopted by the Senate [of Massachusetts]. I therefore this day sent a letter to the two Houses with my resignation of my seat as a Senator of the United States.—*Ibid.*, *535*.

In 1809 President Madison appointed John Quincy Adams minister to Russia and later he was prominent among the American peace commissioners at Ghent. September 25, 1814, he wrote:

. . . in repelling an insolent charge of the British Plenipotentiaries against the government of the United States, of a system of perpetual encroachment upon the Indians under pretence of purchases, I had taken the ground of the moral and religious duty of a nation to settle, cultivate, and improve their territory—a principle perfectly recognized by the law of nations, and in my own opinion, the only solid and unanswerable defense against the charge in the British note. Gallatin saw and admitted the weight of the argument, but was afraid of ridicule. . . . the terms God, and Providence, and Heaven, Mr.

Clay thought were canting, and Russell laughed at them. I was obliged to give them up, and with them what I thought the best argument we had.—*Memoirs, III., 42.*

Clay and Gallatin were associated with Adams to negotiate a convention to regulate commerce and navigation with Great Britain. Adams writes of it when drawn up:

I observed then that there had been another error, both in the preamble and in the order of signatures, at Ghent, which it would be necessary to avoid repeating at present. . . . in the copies on both sides the King of Great Britain and the British Plenipotentiaries were first named; and . . . the signatures all followed each other in succession, the American Plenipotentiaries signing under those of Great Britain. The usage of all treaties between European sovereigns we understood to be what is called the alternative, each of the parties and his plenipotentiaries being first named in the copy which he receives; the signatures of the respective plenipotentiaries being on a line and alternate—those of each party signing first in the copy which he receives. . . . I told Goldburn that if he would take the trouble of inquiring at the foreign office he would find it a universal usage. . . . if he would have a draft copy made out . . . as they intended to execute *their* copy, and send it to me, I would have *our* copy made out corresponding to it, . . . They promised to send me such a draft copy. . . . [A day later] Mr. Gallatin then said that I must give the transcriber orders to make out the copy without any alteration in the body of the treaty; which I peremptorily refused, and added, in a heated and angry manner, "Mr. Gallatin, you and Mr. Clay may do as you please, but I will not sign the treaty without the alternative observed throughout." "Now, don't fly off in this manner," said Mr. Gallatin. "Indeed, Sir," said I, "I will not sign the treaty in any other form. I am so far from thinking with Mr. Clay that it is of no importance, that I think it by much the most important thing that we shall obtain by this treaty."—*Ibid., III, 243 (1815).*

Many rumors of his probable appointment as Secretary of State under Monroe reached Mr. Adams in England. December 24, 1816, he wrote:

I had no expectation, or belief, that the office would be offered to me, until the receipt of my mother's letter, and now I consider it still a matter of great uncertainty. The question whether I ought to accept the place, if it should be offered, is not without difficulties in my mind. A doubt of my competency for it is very sincerely entertained, and ought perhaps to be decisive. At all events, if I could be rationally justified in accepting it, if offered, I perceive no propriety in taking any step whatever to seek it.—*Ibid., 458.*

Some months later he wrote to his mother:

The manner in which the President has thought proper to nominate me was certainly honorable to himself, as it was without any intimation from me, or, as far as I knew, from any of my friends, which could operate as an inducement to him. His motives were altogether of a public nature; . . our sentiments upon subjects of great public interest have at particular periods of our public life been much at variance. That they may be so again is as certainly not impossible. If I had any present reason for expecting it, I should deem it my duty to decline the office . . . Ever since his appointment to the Department of State has brought me into official relations with him, I have known few of his opinions with which I did not cordially concur. . . . For myself, I shall enter upon the functions of my office with a deep sense of the necessity of union with my colleagues, and with a suitable impression that my place is subordinate; that my duty will be to support, and not to counteract or oppose, the President's administration, and that if from any cause I should find my efforts to that end ineffectual, it will be my duty seasonably to withdraw from the public service . . .—*Ibid., 502-04.*

The following extracts from his report of an interview with the British Minister, Canning, on the Oregon question, will indicate the vigorousness of his diplomacy:

But you will understand that I am not pleased either with the grounds upon which you have sought this conference, nor with the questions which you have seen fit to put to me. . . . The members of the legislature of this country are not only perfectly independent of the Executive, but the Executive cannot permit itself to be questioned by any foreign minister upon anything said or done by them. And as little do I admit your right to ask any question of our intentions with regard to the mouth of Colombia River. . . . "No," said I, "I have not heard that you claim exclusively any part of the moon; but there is not a spot on this habitable globe that I could affirm you do not claim; and there is none which you may not claim with as much color of right as you can have to Colombia River or its mouth." . . . "Sir," said I, "you may report to your Government just what you please . . . every word that I have said to you not only now, but at any time, or that I ever shall say, provided you report nothing but the truth, as I have no doubt you will." . . . "But. . . . I request you to state explicitly, that I took strong exception both to the form and to the substance of your application to me on this occasion. To the form, because you came to put questions to me of an irritating nature upon the foundation of the speeches and reports of individual members of Congress; and to the substance, because the questions were of a nature which we do not admit your right to ask. . . . the tone and manner assumed by you in reply convinced me that nothing useful to either party could result from any further verbal conference between us." —*Ibid., V, 244-254.*

The following extracts contain some views of Adams's concerning his elevation to the presidency and his duty therein:

To one thing, however, I had made up my mind; I would take no one step to advance or promote pretensions to the presidency. If that office was to be the prize of cabal and intrigue, of purchasing newspapers, bribing by appointments, or bargaining for foreign missions, I had no ticket in that lottery. Whether I had the qualifications necessary for the President of the United

States was, to say the least, very doubtful to myself. But that I had no talent for obtaining the office by such means was perfectly clear.—*Ibid., V, 298 (1821).*

I determined to renominate every person against whom there was no complaint which would have warranted his removal; and renominated every person nominated by Mr. Monroe, and upon whose nomination the Senate had declined acting. Mr. Monroe always acted on this principle of renomination.—*Ibid., VI, 521.*

Regarding his entering Congress after the expiration of his presidential term:

I said I had in that respect no scruple whatever. No person could be degraded by serving the people as a Representative in Congress. Nor, in my opinion, would an ex-President of the United States be degraded by serving as a Selectman of his town, if elected thereto by the people.—*Ibid., VIII, 239, 1830.*

. . . had I alleged my former station as a reason for rejecting the suffrages of the people assigning me a seat in the House of Representatives, I should not merely have been chargeable with arrogance, but should have exposed myself to ridicule. . . . My return to public life in a subordinate station is disagreeable to my family, and disapproved by some of my friends; though no one of them has expressed that disapprobation to me. . . . But this call upon me by the people of the district in which I reside, to represent them in Congress, has been spontaneous, and, although counteracted by a double opposition, federalist and Jacksonite, I have received nearly three votes in four throughout the district. My election as President of the United States was not half so gratifying to my inmost soul. No election or appointment conferred upon me ever gave me so much pleasure.—*Ibid., 246-247.*

I have been for some time occupied day and night, when at home, in assorting and recording the petitions and remonstrances against the annexation of Texas, and other anti-slavery petitions, which flow upon me in torrents.—*Ibid., IX, 377 (1837).*

My occupations . . . have been confined . . . for the last ten days to the defence of myself against an extensive combination and conspiracy, in and out of Congress, to crush the liberties of the free people of this Union by disgracing me with a brand of censure and displacing me from the chair of the Committee of Foreign Affairs, for my perseverance in presenting abolition petitions.—*Memoirs, XI, 80 (1842).*

One hundred members of the House represent slaves; four-fifths of whom would crucify me if their votes could erect the cross; forty members, representatives of the free, in the league of slavery and mock Democracy, would break me on the wheel, if their votes or wishes could turn it round; and four-fifths of the other hundred and twenty are either so cold or so lukewarm that they are ready to desert me at the first scintillation of indiscretion on my part. The only formidable danger with which I am beset is that of my own temper.—*Ibid., 86 (1842).*

Extracts dealing with the Louisiana Purchase, the slavery struggle, Florida, South America, Cuba, Texas, and related subjects follow.

In a conversation with Mr. Wirt, the Attorney General, about the president's authority to deliver fugitive criminals to England without act of Congress, Adams stated that the president

. . . . could not be bound by the duty without possessing the authority necessary for its discharge.

He [Wirt] said that doctrine was too bold for him: he was too much of a Virginian for that.

I told him that Virginian Constitutional scruples were accommodating things. Whenever the exercise of a power did not happen to suit them, they would allow of nothing but powers expressly written; but when it did, they had no aversion to implied powers. Where was there in the Constitution a power to purchase Louisiana? He said there was a power to make treaties. "Aye! a treaty to abolish the Constitution of the United States?" "Oh, no, no!"

But the Louisiana purchase was in substance a dissolution and recomposition of the whole Union. It made a Union totally different from that for which the Constitution had been formed. It gives despotic powers over the territories purchased. It naturalizes foreign nations in a mass. It makes French and Spanish laws a part of the laws of the Union. It introduces whole systems of legislation abhorrent to the spirit and character of our institutions, and all this done by an Administration which came in blowing a trumpet against implied powers. After this, to nibble at a bank, a road, a canal, the mere mint and cummin of the law, was but glorious inconsistency.

He said the people had sanctioned it. "How the people?" By their Representatives in Congress; they were the people.

"Oh," said I, "*that doctrine is too bold for me.*"—*Ibid., V, 400 (1821).*

And so it is that a law for perpetuating slavery in Missouri, and perhaps in North America, has been smuggled through both Houses of Congress. I have been convinced from the first starting of this question that it could not end otherwise. The fault is in the Constitution of the United States, which has sanctioned a dishonorable compromise with slavery. There is henceforth no remedy for it but a new organization of the Union to effect which a concert of all the white States is indispensable. Whether that can ever be accomplished is doubtful. . . . the cement of common interest produced by slavery is stronger and more solid than that of unmingled freedom. . . . the slave States have clung together in one unbroken phalanx, and have been victorious by the means of accomplices and deserters from the ranks of freedom. Time only can show whether the contest may ever be with equal advantage renewed.—*Ibid., V, 4 (1820).*

I have favored this Missouri compromise, believing it to be all that could be effected under the present Constitution, and from extreme unwillingness to put the Union at hazard. But perhaps it would have been a wiser as well as a bolder course to have persisted in the restriction upon Missouri, till it should have terminated in a convention of the States to revise and amend the Constitution. This would have produced a

new Union of the thirteen or fourteen States unpolluted with slavery, with a great and glorious object to effect, namely, that of rallying to their standard the other States by the universal emancipation of their slaves. If the Union must be dissolved, slavery is precisely the question upon which it ought to break. For the present, however, this contest is laid asleep.—*Ibid., V, 10.*

A dissolution of the Union for the cause of slavery would be followed by a servile war in the slave-holding States, combined with a war between the two severed portions of the Union. It seems to me that its result must be the extirpation of slavery from this whole continent; and, calamitous and desolating as this course of events in its progress must be, so glorious would be its final issue, that, as God shall judge me, I dare not say that it is not to be desired.—*Ibid., V, 210 (1820).*

"I told him that I understood the map of the country rather too well to suppose it would ever be possible for me to do anything that could make me popular in the Western country; that as to the treaty [of 1819], I had never set the value upon it that was supposed, and of all the members of the Administration, I was the last who had consented to take the Sabine for our western boundary. I had no doubt that if the treaty should be set aside we should ultimately obtain more territory than it would secure to us, but we should get the same territory with the treaty sooner than we should want it; and even now I thought the greatest danger of this Union was in the overgrown extent of its territory combining with the slavery question. I added as my belief, that there would be a majority of the House of Representatives now who would not accept of the province of Texas as a gift unless slavery should be excluded from it. Since the Missouri debate, I considered the continuance of the Union for any length of time as very precarious, and entertained serious doubts whether Louisiana and slavery would not ultimately break us up.—*Ibid., V, 67-68 (1820).*

They [the South Americans] are not likely to promote the spirit either of freedom or order by their example. They have not the first elements of good or free government. Arbitrary power, military and ecclesiastical, was stamped upon their education, upon their habits, and upon all their institutions. Civil dis

sension was infused into all their seminal principles. War and mutual destruction was in every member of their organization, moral, political, and physical. I had little expectation of any beneficial result to this country from any future connection with them, political or commercial. We should derive no improvement to our own institution by any communion with theirs. Nor was there any appearance of a disposition in them to take any political lesson from us.—*Ibid., V, 325 (1821).*

Neither were the United States desirous of making it [Cuba] a part of their confederation. But the island was at their doors; they could not suffer it to be transferred from Spain to any other European power, nor could they willingly see it conquered, either by Mexico or Columbia. . . . Cuba was to the United States an object of paramount commercial importance. The capital employed in the trade was greater than that with all the dominion of France; the tonnage employed in it nearly equal to that with Great Britain. We were content that it should remain in its present condition, under the dominion of Spain, but enjoying a free trade with us.—*Ibid., VII, 10 (1825).*

With regard to the project of a separate northern confederacy, formed in the winter of 1803 and 4, in consequence of the Louisiana cession, it is not to me that you must apply for copies of the correspondence in which it was contained. To that and to every other project of disunion, I have been constantly opposed. My principles do not admit the right even of the people, still less of the legislature of any one state in the union, to secede at pleasure from the union. No provision is made for the exercise of this right, either by the federal or any of the state constitutions. The act of exercising it, presupposes a departure from the principle of compact and a resort to that of force. . . . But to those who think that each state is a sovereign judge, not only of its own rights, but of the extent of powers conferred upon the general government by the people of the whole union; and that each state, giving its own construction to the constitutional powers of congress, may array its separate sovereignty against every act of that body transcending this estimate of their powers—to say of men holding these

principles, that, for the ten years from 1804 to 1814, they were intending a dissolution of the union, and the formation of a new confederacy, is charging them with nothing more than with acting up to their principles. —*Niles, XXXV, 415-416.*

Nullification is the provocative to that brutal and foul contest of force, which has hitherto baffled all the efforts of the European and Southern American nations, to introduce among them constitutional governments of liberty and order. It strips us of that peculiar and unimitated characteristic of all our legislation—free debate. It makes the bayonet the arbiter of the law; it has no argument but the thunderbolt. . . . —*Oration, July 4 (1831). Niles, XL, 431.*

Rouse in the heart of the slave holder the terror of his slave, and it will be a motive with him paramount to all others never to vote for any man not a slave holder like himself.—*Memoirs, IX, 252 (1835).*

I gave them [an anti-slavery committee] a full and candid exposition of my own principles and views with regard to the institution of domestic slavery, differing from theirs under a sense of the compact and compromise in the Constitution of the United States. I declined attendance at any public meeting of the societies, and said I believed the cause itself would be more benefitted by such service as I could render to it in the discharge of my duty in Congress than by giving notoriety to any action on my part in support of the societies or in connection with them.—*Ibid., IX, 302 (1836).*

The prohibition of the internal slave-trade is within the constitutional power of Congress, and, in my opinion, is among their incumbent duties. I have gone as far upon this article, the abolition of slavery, as the public opinion of the free portion of the Union will bear, and so far that scarcely a slave-holding member of the House dares to vote with me upon any question. I have as yet been thoroughly sustained in my own State; but one step further and I hazard my own standing and influence there, my own final overthrow, and the cause of liberty itself for indefinite time, certainly for more than my remnant of life.—*Ibid., IX, 418 (1834).*

"The world, the flesh, and all the devils in hell are arrayed against any man who now in this North Amer-

ican Union shall dare to join the standard of Almighty God to put down the African slave-trade; and what can I, upon the verge of my seventy-fourth birthday, with a shaking hand, a darkening eye, a drowsy brain, and with all my faculties dropping from me one by one, as the teeth are dropping from my head—what can I do for the cause of God and man, for the progress of human emancipation, for the suppression of the African slave-trade? Yet my conscience presses me on; let me but die upon the breach."—*Ibid., X, 454 (1841).*

Hamilton's report . . . represents the Texans as a people struggling for their liberty, and therefore entitled to our sympathy. The fact is directly the reverse—they are fighting for the establishment and perpetuation of slavery, and that is the cause of the South Carolinian sympathy for them.—*Ibid., IX, 333 (1836).*

I offered an amendment . . . : That the power of annexing the people of a foreign Government to this Union has not been delegated to the Congress nor to any Department of the Government of the United States, but has been reserved to the people. That any attempt by Act of Congress or by treaty to annex the republic of Texas to this Union would be an usurpation of power, which it would be the right and the duty of the free people of the Union to resist and annul.—*Ibid., X, 20 (1838).*

This was a memorable day in the annals of the world. The treaty for the annexation of Texas to this Union was this day sent in to the Senate: and with it went the freedom of the human race.—*Ibid., XII, 13 (1844).*

I record this vote [rejecting the Texan treaty] as a deliverance, I trust, by the special interposition of Almighty God, of my country and of human liberty from a conspiracy comparable to that of Lucius Sergius Catilina. May it prove not a mere temporary deliverance, like that, only preliminary to the fatally successful conspiracy of Julius Caesar! The annexation of Texas to this Union is the first step to the conquest of all Mexico, of the West India Islands, of a maritime, colonizing, slave-tainted monarchy, and of extinguished freedom.—*Ibid., XII, 49 (1844).*

I do not admit that there is, even among the peace

powers of Congress, such authority; but in *war* there are many ways by which Congress not only have the authority, but are bound to interfere with the institution of slavery in the states. . . . Mr. Chairman, are you ready for all these wars? A Mexican war? a war with Great Britain, if not with France? a general Indian war? a servile war? and, as an inevitable consequence of them all, a civil war? And do you imagine that while with your eyes open you are wilfully kindling, and then closing your eyes and blindly rushing into them; do you imagine that while, in the very nature of things, your own Southern and Southwestern States, must be the Flanders of these complicated wars, the battlefield upon which the last great conflict must be fought between slavery and emancipation? do you imagine that your Congress will have no constitutional authority to interfere with the institution of slavery *in any way* in the States of this confederacy? Sir, they must and will interfere with it—perhaps to sustain it by war; perhaps to abolish it by treaties of peace; and they will not only possess the constitutional power so to interfere, but they will be bound in duty to do it by the express provisions of the Constitution itself. From the instant that your slaveholding states become the theatre of war, civil, servile or foreign, from that instant the war powers of Congress extend to interference with the institution of slavery in every way by which it can be interfered with, from a claim of indemnity for slaves taken or destroyed, to the cession of the State burdened with slavery to a foreign power.—*Cong. Globe, 24th Cong., 1st Sess., App., 434-435.*

References to Jackson's administration:

To feed the cormorant appetite for place, and to reward the prostitution of canvassing defamers, are the only principles yet discernible in the conduct of the President, and indecision and instability are already strongly marked in his movements . . *Memoirs, VIII, 113.*

The appointments, almost without exception, are conferred upon the vilest purveyors of slander during the late electioneering campaign, and an excessive dis-

proportion of places is given to editors of the foulest presses. Very few reputable appointments have been made, . . . —*Ibid., 138.*

Jackson rides roughshod over all the rights and powers of the Senate relating to appointments. Many of his own party in the Senate are disgusted with him for it; but they dare not oppose him . . . —*Ibid., 206.*

I would not be present to witness her [Harvard's] disgrace in conferring her highest literary honors upon a barbarian who could not write a sentence of grammar and hardly could spell his own name.—*Ibid., 546.*

The Monroe Doctrine in outline:

I told him [the Russian Minister] specially that we should contest the right of Russia to *any* territorial establishment on this continent, and that we should assume distinctly the principle that the American continents are no longer subjects for *any* new European colonial establishments.—*Memoirs, VI, 163 (1823).*

Extracts follow relating to various important subjects:

The question of the power of congress to authorize the making of internal improvements, is, in other words, a question whether the people of this union, in forming their common social compact, as avowedly for the purpose of promoting their general welfare, have performed their work in a manner so ineffably stupid, as to deny themselves the means of bettering their own condition. I have too much respect for the intellect of my country to believe it.—*Niles, XXVI, 251 (1824):*

. . . if the house shall settle this question by declaring that they will engage in no more works of internal improvement, this Union will soon break in pieces; and I will add that it will not deserve to be preserved.—*Cong. Debates, 22nd Cong., 1st Sess., 3256.*

" . . . the Pre-emption bill was taken up the thirst of a tiger for blood is the fittest emblem of the rapacity with which the members of all the new states fly at the public lands. The constituents upon whom they depend are all settlers, or tame and careless spectators of the pillage. They are themselves enormous speculators and land-jobbers. It

were a vain attempt to resist them here.—*Memoirs, X, 19 (1838).*

I said that the ultimate principle of my system with reference to the great interests of the country was *conciliation* and not *collision.* I was satisfied with the tariff as now established, and should, if any change in it should be desired, incline rather to reduce than to increase it. There was, in my opinion, no constitutional question involved in the discussion. The revenue was abundant, and the protection to manufactures adequate to their fair claims for support; and if the tariff should be found to bear hard upon the agricultural and commercial interests, I should incline to an alleviation of it in their favor.—*Ibid., VI, 451 (1824).*

The subscriber [J. Q. Adams] has long entertained the opinion that the existence of a national bank is indissolubly connected with the continuance of our National Union. The fiscal operations of the Government in all its branches, he believes, can not, without the aid of such an institution, be conducted, he will not say well, but at all. He does not say that the present Bank of the United States is indispensable; . . —*From Report on The Bank of the United States, Cong. Debates, 22 Cong., 1st Sess., App., 72.*

The spirit of party has become so inveterate and so virulent in our country; it has so totally absorbed the understanding, and the heart of almost all the distinguished men among us, that I, who can not cease to consider all the individuals of both parties as my countrymen; who can neither approve nor disapprove, in a lump, either of the men or the measures of either party; who see both sides claiming an exclusive privilege of patriotism, and using against each other weapons of political warfare which I never can handle, can not but cherish that congenial spirit which has always preserved itself pure from the infectious vapors of faction; which considers temperance, as one of the first political duties; and which can perceive a very distinct shade of difference between political candor and political hypocrisy.—*Niles, XXXVI, 17-18 (1809).*

Concerning Clay (1820):

In politics, as in private life, Clay is essentially a gamester, and, with a vigorous intellect, an ardent

spirit, a handsome elocution, though with a mind very defective in elementary knowledge, and a very undigested system of ethics, he has all the qualities which belong to that class of human characters.—*Memoirs, V, 59.*

Of Daniel Webster he says (1841):

. . . my speech . . . has given him the means of saving himself from ruin, and his country from a most disastrous war. My reward from him will be professions of respect and esteem, speeches of approbation and regard for me to my friends, knowing that they will be reported to me, secret and deep-laid intrigues against me, and still more venomous against my son. Such is human nature, in the gigantic intellect, the envious temper, the ravenous ambition, and the rotten heart of Daniel Webster. His treatment of me has been, is, and will be, an improved edition of Andrew Jackson's gratitude."—*Ibid., XI, 20.*

PERSONAL ITEMS

My short discipline of fifteen months at Harvard University was the introduction to all the prosperity that has ever befallen me, and perhaps saved me from early ruin.—*Ibid., IX, 354.*

Five or six small crackers and a glass of water give me a sumptuous dinner. . . . I am calm and composed for the evening session, and far better prepared for taking part in any debate than after the most temperate dinner at home or abroad.—*Ibid., IX, 408 (1837).*

I informed Mr. Whitney also of my wish to join in communion with the church of which he is the pastor. I ought to have joined it thirty years ago and more, but the tumult of the world, false shame, a distrust of my own worthiness to partake of the communion, and a residence elsewhere, and continually changing, made me defer it to a more convenient opportunity.—*Ibid., VII, 147 (1826).*

I deem it the duty of every Christian man, when he betakes himself to his nightly pillow, in self-examination to say, What good have I done this day? Ay! and what evil have I done that may be repaired or repented of? Nor should he rise from that pillow the next morn-

ing till after the enquiry, What good can I do and to whom this day? I have made this my rule for many years.—*I bid., IX, 269 (1842).*

My self-examination this night gave rise to many mortifying reflections. I often see and often condemn my faults. But for the efficacy of correction I am afraid some penalty is necessary.—*I bid., I, 276 (1803).*

. . conversation, an art of which I never had an adequate idea. . . I never knew how to make, to control, or to change it. I am by nature a silent animal, . . . my deficiency —the talent of starting the game. A man who has that need talk but little himself.—*I bid., V, 165.*

Literature has been the charm of my life, and, could I have carved out my own fortunes, to literature would my whole life have been devoted.—*I bid., V, 219 (1820).*

At certain seasons, however, the propensity becomes too strong for me. I walk and muse and poor forth premeditated verse, which it takes me six or nine months to lay by and resume to find it good for nothing. It never appears so to me when I compose it. In a few instances I have suffered the publication of my effusions, and I am accredited as one of the smallest poets of my country.—*I bid., VIII, 339 (1831).*

OTHER BRIEF EXTRACTS

A letter book, a diary, a book of receipts and expenses—these three books, kept without intermission, should be the rule of duty of every man who can read and write. But to keep them perseveringly requires a character to which toil is a pleasure, and of which untiring patience is an essential element.—*I bid., IX, 159.*

Democracy has no monuments; it strikes no medals; it bears the head of no man upon a coin; its very essence is iconoclastic. This is why Congress has never been able to erect a monument to Washington.—*I bid., VIII, 433.*

. . . in this country, politicians of desperate private fortunes always find the means of keeping themselves above water as public men.—*I bid., V, 39.*

In the turbid stream of political life, a conscientious man must endeavor to do justice to all, and to return good for evil; but he must always expect a return of evil for good.—*I bid., IX, 242.*

A remark that I have occasion frequently to make is, that moral considerations seldom appear to have much weight in the minds of our statesmen, unless connected with popular feelings. . . My own deliberate opinion is, that the more of pure moral principle is carried into the policy and conduct of a Government, the wiser and more profound will that policy be.—*Ibid., V, 47 (1820).*

This fashion of peddling for popularity by travelling round the country gathering crowds together, hawking for public dinners, and spouting empty speeches, is growing into high fashion. It was formerly confined to the Presidents, but De Witt Clinton made some unsuccessful experiments of it. Mr. Clay has mounted that hobby often, and rides him very hard.—*Ibid., IX. 25 (1833).*

QUESTIONS.

1. What can you find about Adam's early training and education? 2. What were his views of office holding? 3. What languages do you find him studying at one time? 4. How wide was his range of reading?

1. Compare his views of the tariff and the Navigation Act. 2. Wherein are they similar subjects? 3. What were the relations of Adams to the political parties of his time? 4. What were his views of parties and partisanship? 5. What reasons did he give for any change of party? 6. What did he think the duty of the Senate as to appointments? 7. What was his influence in the Senate first and last? 8. What change occurred in his political prospects while in the Senate, and why? 9. What was his position on the embargo and its effect? 10. Can you decide whether he thought the embargo a wise measure?

1. Views of Adams as to the settlement of the West and Indian rights to land. 2. What stand did he take as to signatures to treaties, and why was he so decided about it? 3. Form an opinion of Adams as a diplomat. 4. How long before his election do you find him to be a presidential possibility? 5. Why was he so much gratified at his election to the House of Representatives? 6. What does he regard as the causes of the opposition to him in Congress? 7. Compare the views of Wirt and Adams as to implied powers in the constitution. 8. Can you determine whether Adams opposed the Louisiana purchase? 9. Determine his views as to expansion in general. 10. What conditions affected them in some cases that are now non-existent?

1. What solutions of the slavery problem did Adams suggest? 2. Which one was highly prophetic of the historical solution? 3. Find prophetic elements in the others as far as possible. 4. Why could not Adams be popular in the West? 5. What were his views as to Texas in 1819? 6. Much later? 7. How nearly correct was his judgment as to the S. A. republics? 8. What can you learn of projects to dissolve the Union? 9. How near did Adams come to favoring a dissolution of it? 10. What were his views at different periods as to its stability? 11. What did he think of nullification? 12. Of the abolitionists and of abolition? 13. Collect his views on all possible phases of the slavery question. 14. How important did Adams consider the work of internal improvements? 15. How much of the Monroe Doctrine can you find? 16. What did Adams think of the public lands?

1. Sum up the personal traits of J. Q. Adams. 2. What elements of character contributed to his successful career. 3. Write his life based on these extracts. 4. What points are too obscure for satisfactory treatment? 5. Which of the questions of his time are open questions to-day? 6. On which of the settled questions was he right? 7. On which was he wrong? 8. Were there any changes in views due to wider experience or to changed conditions? 9. Which of your answers to the above questions are you sure of? 10. Which are merely an opinion. 11. Which questions are unanswerable from the given data? 12. Consider the value of the material of this study. 13. What are your conclusions concerning the man? 14. Ask and answer other questions of your own? 15. Use the questions of last month so far as they are adapted to this study.

HENRY CLAY

Born near Richmond, 1777. Moved to Kentucky, 1797. Member of Kentucky legislature, off and on, 1801-1811. Senator, 1806; again, 1809. Speaker House of Representatives, 1811-1821, 1823-1825. Secretary of State, 1825-1829. Candidate for President, 1824, 1832, 1844. Candidate for nomination, 1840, 1848. Senator, 1829-1842; again, 1849-1852. Died, 1852.

CHAPTER III

HENRY CLAY

PERHAPS no man in American history has had so great a direct influence on legislation as Henry Clay. As Speaker of the House for about twelve years he appointed the committees, and thus determined largely the direction legislation should take. His influence as Speaker was also a powerful factor in other ways. From 1831 to 1852 he was in the Senate for the larger part of the time, and shared with Webster and Calhoun in its leadership. In many ways, probably, he was not the equal of either, but as a leader of men he was their superior. It thus happened that he could secure his will more frequently than either. On the whole his career was more completely legislative than any of our other great statesmen. Only once, in 1814–15, did he turn to diplomacy, and but once, from 1825–29, did he enter the field of administration. His life was given over to a study of legislative processes and legislative needs.

It may be confidently affirmed that legislation is more fundamental, and more important, than either administrative or judicial processes. Primarily it has to do with determining the will of the state, and securing its proper and adequate expression. To be sure, the execu-

tive department of government must carry that will into operation, or it is worthless, or possibly worse. The judiciary must be capable of judging what that will is, and, in nations with constitutions like our own, holding the legislature down to an interpretation of its powers in accordance with its constitutional rights. Yet, when all has been said, it still remains true that *to will* is of greater importance than *to execute* or *to judge*. A government *must* fail that can not find an easy and adequate expression for its will; it *may* fail, even when this is secured, if the other departments of government are incompetent or not properly organized. If this analysis then be correct, our series of studies for this year, concerned as it is with the men who as legislators have had to do with the will of the nation, with its most important function, becomes of the highest value. There is perhaps one time in a nation's history when the executive surpasses in importance even the legislature, and that is in time of war. Of course, then it is the *force* of the nation that must be wielded. For nations, therefore, whose life has been martial, not industrial, the reverse of what I have said above may be true. But for nations like our own, peaceful, industrial, and democratic, the important field of work for the statesman is in legislation, in finding out and properly expressing its will. In the list of men who have had to do in formulating this will, Clay stands second, perhaps, to none. The very few names in American history—Washington's, Hamilton's, Jefferson's, Lincoln's—that tower above his, were great personalities as well—were administrators in

moments of great need; or were creators of great policies.

Of Clay's writings in early years we have almost nothing left. It is not till he becomes the nation's that we can let him speak of himself. This study, therefore, is necessarily largely a direct study of his course in Congress, acting for the people.

In 1829 in a speech to his constituents Clay tells us something of himself, and gives us an insight into his character in many ways when he does not directly speak of himself:

I fear, friends and fellow-citizens, that if I could find language to express the feelings which now animate me, I could not be heard throughout this vast assembly. My voice, once strong and powerful, has had its vigor impaired by delicate health and advancing age. . . . I behold gathered here, sires far advanced in years, endeared to me by an interchange of friendly office and sympathetic feeling, beginning more than thirty years ago. Their sons, grown up during my absence in the public councils, accompany them; and all, prompted by ardent attachment, affectionately surrounding and saluting me, as if I belonged to their own household. . . . I consider this day the proudest of my life.

* * * *

No occasion can be more appropriate than the present, when surrounded by my former constituents, to say a few words upon the unimportant subject of myself. Prior to my return home I had stated, in answer to all inquiries whether I should be again presented as a candidate to represent my old district in the house of representatives, that I should come to no absolute decision, until I had taken time for reflection, and to ascertain what might be the feelings and wishes of those who had so often honored me with their suffrages. The present representative of the district has conducted himself towards me with the greatest liberality. . . He had promptly declined being a candidate, if I would offer, and he warmly urged me to offer. Since my return home, I have mixed freely as I could with

my fellow-citizens of the district. They have met me with the greatest cordiality. Many of them have expressed a wish that I would again represent them. Some of the most prominent and respectable of those who voted for the present chief magistrate [Jackson] have also expressed a similar wish. I have every reason to believe, that there would be no opposition to me, from any quarter or any party, if I were to offer But . . . under all circumstances, I think that, . . I may continue at home for a season, if not during the remainder of my life, among my friends and old constituents, cheering and cheered by them, and interchanging all the kind and friendly offices incident to private life. . . .

And now, my friends and fellow-citizens, I cannot part from you, on possibly this last occasion of my ever publicly addressing you, without reiterating the expression of my thanks from a heart overflowing with gratitude. I came among you, now more than thirty years ago, an orphan boy, penniless, stranger to you all, without friends, without the favor of the great. You took me up, cherished me, caressed me, protected me, honored me. You have constantly poured upon me a bold and unabated stream of innumerable favors. Time, which wears out everything, has increased and strengthened your affection for me. When I seemed deserted by almost the whole world, and assailed by almost every tongue, and pen, and press, you have fearlessly and manfully stood by me, with unsurpassed zeal and undiminished friendship. When I felt as if I should sink beneath the storm of abuse and detraction, which was violently raging around me, I have found myself upheld and sustained by your encouraging voices, and your approving smiles. I have doubtless committed many faults and indiscretions, over which you have thrown the broad mantle of your charity. But I can say, and in the presence of my God and this assembled multitude, I will say, that I have honestly and faithfully served my country: that I have never wronged it; and that, however unprepared I lament that I am to appear in the Divine presence on other accounts, I invoke the stern justice of His judgment on my public conduct, without the smallest apprehension of his dis-

pleasure.—*Colton, Life and Speeches of Clay, Vol. I., pp. 568, 569, 582, 585.*

That Clay was sensitive to public criticism, in his early years at least, may be seen in this letter from Mr. Brown, his brother-in-law, of September 1, 1808:

. . . I am sorry you do not live in better times, for you have talents to adorn a public station, and to be useful to your country. But to me character is more dear than every other thing; and can any man hope to preserve it in the present miserable state of things? You have carried your election. I am rejoiced at it. Your enemies will be wounded. But I pray you to quit public life, or muster up sufficient philosophy to bear up under all the hard names with which you will be christened in the papers. You are, it seems, a Burrite . . . What you may next be called is uncertain; but as long as you retain your brains and your independence you will be abused. Republicanism demands that a man of talents should be kept down by detraction. Too much genius, like too much wealth, destroys equality, the very soul of democracy. But I forbear. You will say that I have become splenetic, or rather that I have always been subject to that infirmity.—*Colton, Private Correspondence of Clay, p. 16.*

The following is an extract from the earliest preserved speech of Clay made in Congress.

. . . In inculcating the advantages of domestic manufactures, it never entered the head, I presume, of any one, to change the habits of the nation from an agricultural to a manufacturing community. No one, I am persuaded, ever thought of converting the plowshare and the sickle into the spindle and the shuttle.

. . . The opponents of the manufacturing system transport themselves to the establishments of Manchester and Birmingham, and, dwelling on the indigence, vice, and wretchedness prevailing there, by pushing it to an *extreme*, argue that its introduction into this country will necessarily be attended by the same mischievous and dreadful consequences. But what is the fact? That England is the manufacturer of a great

part of the world; and that, even then, the numbers thus employed bear an inconsiderable proportion to the whole mass of population. Were we to become the manufacturers of other nations, effects of the same kind might result. But if we *limit* our efforts, by our own wants, the evils apprehended would be found to be chimerical. The invention and improvement of machinery, . . . dispensing in a great degree with manual labor; and the employment of those persons, who, if we were engaged in the pursuit of agriculture alone, would be either unproductive, or exposed to indolence and immorality, will enable us to supply our own wants without withdrawing our attention from agriculture—that first and greatest source of national wealth and happiness. . . . It is certainly desirable, that the exports of the country should continue to be the surplus production of tillage, and not become those of manufacturing establishments. But it is important to diminish our imports: to furnish ourselves with clothing, made by our own industry; and to cease to be dependent, for the very coats we wear, upon a foreign and perhaps inimical country. The nation that imports its clothing from abroad is but little less dependent than if it imported its bread. . . . *Clay's Speeches, I., pp. 195, 196.*

Fourteen years later Clay made his first really great speech on the tariff. Webster responded, and the two speeches may be regarded as classics on the subject. Clay had not been silent on the topic in the preceding years, but none of these earlier speeches had added much of value to the discussion. Now in 1824 he says:

Two classes of politicians divide the people of the United States. According to the system of one, the produce of foreign industry should be subjected to no other impost than such as may be necessary to provide a public revenue; . . . According to the system of the other class, whilst they agree that the imposts should be mainly . . . relied on as a fit and convenient source of public revenue, they would so adjust and arrange the duties on foreign fabrics as to afford a

gradual but adequate protection to American industry, and lessen our dependence on foreign nations, by securing a certain and ultimately a cheaper and better supply of our own wants from our own abundant resources. Both classes are equally sincere, in their respective opinions, equally honest, equally patriotic, and equally desirous of advancing the prosperity of the country. . . .

In casting our eyes around us, the most prominent circumstance which fixes our attention, and challenges our deepest regret, is the general distress which pervades the whole country. . . . This distress pervades every part of the union, every class of society; . . . what, again I would ask, is the CAUSE of the unhappy condition of our country, which I have faintly depicted? It is to be found in the fact that, during almost the whole existence of this government, we have shaped our industry, our navigation, and our commerce, in reference to an extraordinary war in Europe, and to foreign markets, which no longer exist; in the fact that we have depended too much upon foreign sources of supply, and excited too little the native: . . .

Both the inability and the policy of foreign powers, then, forbid us to rely upon the foreign market, as being an adequate vent for the surplus produce of American labor. . . .

Our agriculture is our greatest interest. It ought ever to be predominant. All others should bend to it. . . . Can we do nothing to invigorate it; nothing to correct the errors of the past, and to brighten the still more unpromising prospects which lie before us? . . . We have seen, that an exclusive dependence on the foreign market must lead to still severer distress, to impoverishment, to *ruin*. We must then change somewhat our course. We must give a new direction to some portion of our industry. We must speedily adopt a genuine American policy. Still cherishing the foreign market, let us create also a home market, to give further scope to the consumption of the produce of American industry. . . .

The creation of a home market is not only necessary to procure for our agriculture a just reward of its labor, but it is indispensable to obtain a supply of our necessary wants. If we cannot sell, we cannot buy. . . .

Mr. Chairman, our confederacy comprehends, within its vast limits, great diversity of interests; agriculture, planting, farming, commercial, navigating, fishing, manufacturing. . . . All these great interests are confided to the protection of one government—to the fate of one ship; . . . If we prosper, and are happy, protection must be extended to all; it is due to all. . . . [For the other side read Webster's reply.]— . . . (*Clay's Speeches, I, 441, 442, 443, 446, 450, 478.*

Eight years now pass away before we again notice Clay's position on the tariff. He had made many speeches in the meantime, but all were in harmony with the one quoted for 1824. January 11, 1832, he moved the following resolution, and then addressed the Senate in its support:

Resolved, that the existing duties upon articles imported from foreign countries, and not coming into competition with similar articles made or produced within the United States, ought to be forthwith abolished, except the duties upon wines and silks, and that those ought to be reduced. . . .

He then says:

It forms no part of my present purpose to enter into a consideration of the *established policy of protection*. . . .

Although it may be impracticable to say what the exact amount of the public revenue should be for the future, . . . we may safely assume that the revenue may now be reduced, and considerably reduced. This reduction may be effected in various ways and on different principles. Only three modes shall now be noticed.

First, to reduce duties on all articles in the same ratio, without regard to the principle of protection. Second, to retain them on the unprotected articles, and augment them on the protected articles, and, Third, to abolish and reduce the duties on unprotected articles, retaining and enforcing the faithful collection of those on the protected articles.

To the first mode there are insuperable objections. It would lead inevitably to the destruction of our home manufactures. . . .

The second would be still more objectionable to the foes of the tariff than either of the others. . . The consequence of such an augmentation would be a great diminution in the importation of the foregoing article, and of course of the duties upon it. But against entire prohibition, except perhaps in a few instances, I have been always and still am opposed. By leaving the door open to the foreign rival article, the benefit is secured of a salutary competition. If it be hermetically closed, the danger is incurred of monopoly.

The third mode is the most equitable and reasonable. . . . It exacts no sacrifice of principle from the opponents of the *American System*, it comprehends none on the part of its friends. . . . *Clay's Speeches, Vol. I, pp. 614, 619, 620.*

These resolutions and this speech brought forth a long debate. In reply to General Hayne, of South Carolina, Clay made the longest speech of his life on the tariff. For three days he discussed the question. Of course only a few extracts can be here given:

. . . When gentlemen have succeeded in their design of an immediate or gradual destruction of the American system, what is their substitute? Free trade? Free trade! The call for free trade is as unavailing, as the cry of a spoiled child in its nurse's arms, for the moon, or the stars that glitter in the firmament of heaven. It never has existed, it never will exist. Trade implies at least two parties. To be free, it should be fair, equal, and reciprocal. But if we throw our ports wide open to the admission of foreign productions, free of all duty, what ports of any other foreign nations shall we find open to the free admission of our surplus produce? We may break down all barriers to free trade on our part, but the work will not be complete, until foreign powers shall have removed theirs. There would be freedom on one side, and restrictions, prohibitions, and exclusions on the other. The bolts and the bars

and the chains of all other nations will remain undisturbed. . . .

. . . I will now, Mr. President, proceed to a more particular consideration of the arguments urged against the protective system, . . . It is alleged, that the system operates prejudicially to the cotton planter, by diminishing the foreign demand for this staple; that we cannot sell to Great Britain unless we buy from her; that the import duty is equivalent to an export duty, and falls upon the cotton grower; that South Carolina pays a disproportionate quota of the public revenue; that an abandonment of the protective policy would lead to an augmentation of our exports; of an amount not less than one hundred and fifty millions of dollars; and finally that the South cannot partake of the advantages of manufacturing, if there be any. . . . I conclude this part of the argument with the hope that my humble exertions have not been altogether unsuccessful in showing,

First, That the policy we have been considering ought to continue to be regarded as the genuine American system.

Secondly, That the free trade system, which is proposed as its substitute, ought really to be considered as the British colonial system.

Thirdly, That the American system is beneficial to all parts of the Union, and absolutely necessary to much the larger portion.

Fourthly, that the price of the great staple of cotton, and of all our chief productions of agriculture, has been sustained, and a decline averted, by the protective system.

Fifthly, that if the foreign demand for cotton has been at all diminished, . . . the diminution has been more than compensated, in the additional demand created at home.

Sixthly, That the constant tendency of the system, by creating competition among ourselves, and between American and European industry, . . . is to reduce prices of manufactured objects.

Eighthly, That if, in a season of peace, these benefits are experienced, in a season of war, . . . they would be much more extensively felt.

Ninthly, and finally, [its abandonment] would lead to the prostration of our manufactures, general impoverishment, and ultimate ruin.—*Clay's Speeches, Vol. II, pp. 17, 23, 45, 46.*

February 12, 1833, Clay argued in favor of the compromise tariff bill. In part he said:

I yesterday, sir, gave notice that I should ask leave to introduce a bill to modify the various acts imposing duties on imports, . . . I am anxious to find out some principle of mutual accommodation, to satisfy, as far as practicable, both parties . . . I propose to give protection to our manufactured articles, adequate protection for a length of time, . . . and on the other, proposing to reduce the duties to that revenue standard, for which the opponents of the system have so long contended.

* * * *

If there be any who want civil war, . . . I am not one of them. I wish to see war of no kind; but above all I do not desire to see civil war. . . . When a civil war shall be lighted up in the bosom of our own happy land, and armies are marching, and commanders are winning their victories, and fleets are in motion on our coast, tell me, if you can . . . its duration.

In conclusion, allow me to entreat and implore each individual member of this body to bring into the consideration of this measure, which I have had the honor of proposing, the same love of country, which, if I know myself, has actuated me, and the same desire of restoring harmony to the Union which has prompted this effort. . . . —*Clay's Speeches, II, pp. 107, 108, 120.*

Compare this with the above:

The foreign policy which I think this country ought to adopt, presents one of those exceptions. It would perhaps be better for mankind, if, in the intercourse between nations, all would leave skill and industry to their unstimulated exertions. But this is not done; and if other powers will incite the industry of their subjects, and depress that of our citizens, in instances where they may come into competition, we must imi-

tate their selfish example. Hence the necessity to protect our manufacturers.—*Clay's Speeches, Vol. I, p. 318.*

The second speech made by Clay in Congress, which has come down to us, argued that West Florida was a part of the Louisiana Purchase. After a careful historical argument, Clay says:

. . . The gentleman conceives it ungenerous, that we should at this moment, when Spain is encompassed and pressed on all sides, by the immense power of her enemy, occupy West Florida. Shall we sit by, passive spectators, and witness the interesting transactions of that country—transactions which tend, in the most imminent degree, to jeopardize our rights, without attempting to interfere? Are you prepared to see a foreign power seize what belongs to us? . . . I have no hesitation in saying, that if a parent country, will not or cannot maintain its authority, in a colony adjacent to us, and there exists in it a state of misrule and disorder, menacing to our peace; . . . we have a right, upon the eternal principles of self-preservation, to lay hold upon it. This principle alone, independent of any title, would warrant our occupation of West Florida. But it is not necessary to resort to it—our title being, in my judgment, incontestably good . . . But the gentleman reminds us that Great Britain, the ally of Spain, may be obliged, by her connection with that country, to take part with her against us, and to consider this measure of the president [taking possession of West Florida] as justifying an appeal to arms. Sir, is the time never to arrive, when we may arrange our own affairs without the fear of insulting his Britannic majesty? Is the rod of British power to be forever suspended over our heads? . . . Mr. President, I have before said on this floor, and now take occasion to remark, that I most sincerely desire peace and amity with England; that I ever prefer an adjustment of all differences with her, before one with any other nation. But if she persists in a denial of justice to us, or if she avails herself of the occupation of West Florida, to commence war upon us, I trust and hope that all hearts will unite, in a bold and vigorous vindication of our rights. . . .

I am not, sir, in favor of cherishing the passion of conquest. But I must be permitted, in conclusion, to indulge the hope of seeing, ere long, the *new* United States (if you will allow me the expression) embracing not only the old thirteen states, but the entire country east of the Mississippi, including East Florida, and some of the territories of the north of us also.—*Clay's Speeches, Vol. I, p. 207, 208.*

A year later Clay, in speaking in favor of increasing the army, showed still more clearly what he conceived the United States should do in the then existing foreign conditions:

What are we to gain by the war? has been emphatically asked. In reply, he would ask, what are we not to lose by peace? Commerce, character, a nation's best treasure, honor. . . .

He had no disposition to magnify or dwell upon the catalogue of injuries we had received from England. He could not, however, overlook the impressment of our seamen—an aggression upon which he never reflected, without feelings of indignation. . . . Not content with seizing upon all our property which falls within her rapacious grasp, the personal rights of our countrymen—rights which forever ought to be sacred—are trampled upon and violated. . . .

He contended, that the real cause of British aggression was, not to distress an enemy, but to destroy a rival. A comparative view of our commerce with that of England and the continent, would satisfy anyone of the truth of this remark. . . . *Clay's Speeches, Vol. I, pp. 226-228.*

Again he says:

. . . An honorable peace is attainable only by an efficient war. My plan would be, to call out the ample resources of the country, give then a judicious direction, prosecute the war with the utmost vigor, strike wherever we can reach the enemy, at sea or on land, and negotiate the terms of peace at Quebec or at Halifax. We are told that England is a proud and lofty nation, which, disdaining to wait for danger, meets it half way. Haughty as she is, we once triumphed over

her, and, if we do not listen to the counsels of timidity and despair, we shall again prevail. In such a cause with the aid of providence, we must come out crowned with success; but if we fail, let us fail like men, lash ourselves to our gallant tars, and expire together in one common struggle, fighting for FREE TRADE AND SEAMEN'S RIGHTS. . . . [Speech on the Army Bill] - *Clay's Speeches, Vol. I, p. 258.*

Clay used the following arguments, in 1811, in his discussion of the question whether the national bank should be rechartered:

This vagrant power to erect a bank, after having wandered throughout the whole constitution in quest of some congenial spot to fasten upon, has been at length located by the gentleman from Georgia on that provision which authorizes congress to lay and collect taxes, etc. In 1791, the power is referred to one part of the instrument; in 1811 to another. Sometimes it is alleged to be deducible from the power to regulate commerce. Hard pressed here, it disappears, and shows itself under the grant to coin money. The sagacious secretary of the treasury in 1791, pursued the wisest course; he has taken shelter behind general high sounding and imposing terms. He has declared in the preamble to the act establishing the bank, that it will be very *conducive* to the successful *conducting* of the national *finances;* will *tend* to give *facility* to the obtaining of loans, and will be *productive* of considerable advantage to *trade* and *industry* in general. No allusion is made to the collection of taxes. What is the nature of this government? It is emphatically federal, vested with an aggregate of specified powers for general purposes, conceded by existing sovereignties, who have themselves retained what is not so conceded. It is said that there are cases in which it must act on implied powers. This is not controverted, but the implication must be necessary, and obviously flow from the enumerated power with which it is allied. The power to charter companies is not specified in the grant, and I contend is of a nature not transferable by mere implication

I conceive, then, sir, that we were not empowered by

the constitution, nor bound by any practice under it, to renew the charter of this bank, and I might here rest the argument. [Speech on Bank charter]—*Clay's Speeches, Vol. I, pp. 2 3, 220.*

In 1832, his feelings towards the bank may be seen in this quotation:

I voted, in 1811, against the old bank of the United States, and I delivered on that occasion, a speech, in which, among other reasons I assigned that of its being unconstitutional. My speech has been read to the Senate, during the progress of this bill, but the reading of it excited no other regret than that it was read in such a wretched, bungling, mangling manner. During a long public life, (I mention the fact not as claiming any merit for it,) the only great question in which I have ever changed my opinion, is that of the bank of the United States. If the researches of the Senator had carried him a little further, he would, by turning over a few more leaves of the same book from which he read my speech, have found that which I made in 1816, in support of the present bank. By the reasons assigned in it for the change of my opinion, I am ready to abide in the judgment of the present generation and of posterity. . . . —*Clay's Speeches, Vol. II, p. 98.*

Study the following extracts to find Clay's views in regard to the relation of State and Union:

. . . Greatly as I venerate the state which gave me birth, and much as I respect the judges of its supreme court, several of whom are my personal friends, I am obliged to think that some of the doctrines which that state has recently held concerning state rights, are fraught with much danger. If those doctrines had been asserted during the late war, a large share of the public disapprobation which has been given to Massachusetts would have fallen to Virginia. What are these doctrines? The courts of Virginia assert, that they have a right to determine on the constitutionality of any law or treaty of the United States, and to expound them according to their own views, even if they

should vary from the decision of the Supreme court of the United States. They assert more – that from their decision there can be no appeal to the supreme court of the United States; that there exists in congress no power to frame a law, obliging the court of the state, in the last resort, to submit its decision to the supervision of the supreme court of the United States. . . . *Clay's Speeches, Vol. I, p. 305.*

* * * *

In cases where there are two systems of government, operating at the same time and place, over the same people, the one general, the other local or particular, one system or the other must possess the right to decide upon the extent of the powers, in cases of collision, which are claimed by the general government. No third party of sufficient impartiality, weight or responsibility, other than such a tribunal as a supreme court, has yet been devised, or perhaps can be created. The doctrine of one side is that the general government though limited in its nature, must necessarily possess the power to ascertain what authority it has, and, by consequence, the extent of that authority.

* * * *

The South Carolina doctrine, on the other side, is, that that state has the right to determine the limits of the powers granted to the general government; and that whenever any of its acts transcend those limits, in the opinion of the state of South Carolina, she is competent to annul them. . . . It is admitted that the South Carolina doctrine is liable to abuse; but it is contended, that the patriotism of each state is an adequate security, and that the nullifying power would only be exercised, 'in an extraordinary case where the powers reserved to the states, under the constitution, are usurped by the federal government. And is not the patriotism of all the states, as great a safeguard against the assumption of powers, not conferred upon the general government, as the patriotism of one state is against the denial of powers which are clearly granted. . . . [Speech on Nullification] *Clay's Speeches, Vol. I, p. 601, 602.*

Spanish-American relations:

I beg, in the first place, to correct misconceptions, if

any exist in regard to my opinions. I am averse to war with Spain, or with any power. I would give no just cause of war to any power—not to Spain herself. I have seen enough of war, and of its calamities, even when successful. No country upon earth has more interest than this in cultivating peace and avoiding war, as long as it is possible honorably to avoid it.

Spain has undoubtedly given us abundant and just cause of war. But it is not every cause of war that should lead to war. War is one of those dreadful scourges, that so shakes the foundations of society, overturns or changes the character of governments, interrupts or destroys the pursuits of private happiness, brings, in short, misery and wretchedness in so many forms, and at last is, in its issue so doubtful and hazardous, that nothing but dire necessity can justify an appeal to arms. . . . I am no propagandist. I would not seek to force upon other nations our principles and our liberty, if they do not want them. I would not disturb the repose even of a detestable despotism. But if an abused and oppressed people will their freedom; if they seek to establish it; if, in truth they have established it; we have a right as a sovereign power, to notice the fact, and to act as circumstances and our interests require. . . . [Speech on the Emancipation of South America].—*Clay's Speeches, Vol. I, pp. 325, 326.*

Jackson's actions in connection with the Seminole War bring forth the following cutting remarks from Clay:

The gentleman from Massachusetts may tell me if he chooses what he pleases about the tomahawk and scalping knife; about Indian enormities, and foreign miscreants and incendiaries. I, too, hate them; from my very soul I abominate them. But I love my country and its constitution; I love liberty and safety, and fear military despotism more, even, than I hate these monsters.

* * * *

I hope not to be misunderstood; I am far from intimating that General Jackson cherishes any designs inimical to the liberties of the country. I believe his in-

tentions to be pure and patriotic. I thank God that he would not, but I thank him still more that he could not if he would, overrun the liberties of the republic. But precedents, if bad, are fraught with the most dangerous consequences. . . . To you Mr. Chairman, belongs the high privilege of transmitting, unimpaired, to posterity, the fair character and liberty of our country. Do you expect to execute this high trust, by trampling, or suffering to be trampled down, law, justice, the constitution, and the rights of the people? by exhibiting examples of inhumanity, and cruelty and ambition? . . . I am not disposed to censure the President for not ordering a court of inquiry, or a general court martial. Perhaps, impelled by a sense of gratitude, he determined, by anticipation, to extend to the general that pardon which he had the undoubted right to grant after sentence. Let us not shrink from our duty. Let us assert our constitutional powers, and vindicate the instrument from military violation. [Speech on the Seminole War].—*Clay's Speeches, Vol. I, p. 389.*

* * * *

Clay breaks forth in these impassioned words in his speech on the Greek Revolution:

Are we so humble, so low, so debased, that, we dare not express our sympathy for suffering Greece; that we dare not articulate our detestation of the brutal excesses of which she has been the bleeding victim, lest we might offend some one or more of their imperial and royal majesties? . . . Are we so mean, so base, so despicable, that we may not attempt to express our horror, utter our indignation, at the most brutal and atrocious war that ever stained earth or shocked high heaven? at the ferocious deeds of a savage and infuriated soldiery, stimulated and urged on by the clergy of a fanatical and inimical religion, and rioting in all the excesses of blood and butchery, at the mere details of which the heart sickens and recoils? . . . [Speech on the Greek Revolution]—*Clay's Speeches, Vol. I, p. 437.*

These extracts give us an insight into Clay's ideas concerning the negro, and what could be done for him:

The object of the society was the colonization of the free colored people, not the slaves of the country. . .

Numbers of the free African race among us are willing to go to Africa. The society has never experienced any difficulty on that subject except that its means of comfortable transportation have been inadequate to accommodate all who have been anxious to migrate. Why should they not go? Here they are in the lowest stage of social gradation; aliens, political, moral, and social aliens—strangers though natives. There they would be in the midst of their friends and their kindred, at home, though born in a foreign land, and elevated above the natives of the country, as much as they are degraded here below the other classes of the community. . . .

* * * *

The colonization society has never imagined it to be practicable, or within the reach of any means which the several governments of the union could bring to bear on the subject, to transport the whole of the African race within the limits of the United States.

* * * *

This society is well aware, I repeat, that they can not touch the subject of slavery. . . . Of all descriptions of our population, that of the free colored, taken in the aggregate, is the least prolific, because of the checks arising from vice and want. . . . If I could be instrumental in eradicating the deepest stain upon the character of the country, and removing all cause of reproach on account of it, by foreign nations; if I could only be instrumental in ridding of this foul blot that revered state that gave me birth, or that not less beloved state which kindly adopted me as her son; I would not exchange the proud satisfaction which I should enjoy, for the honor of all the triumphs ever decreed to the most successful conqueror. . . There is a moral fitness in the idea of returning to Africa her children, whose ancestors have been torn from her by the ruthless hand of fraud and violence. Transplanted in a foreign land, they will carry back to their native soil the rich fruits of religion, civilization, law, and liberty. . . Of all classes of our population, the

most vicious is that of the free colored. It is the inevitable result of their moral, political, and civil degradation. Contaminated themselves, they extend their vices to all around them, to the slaves and to the whites. If the principle of colonization should be confined to them; if a colony can be firmly established and successfully continued in Africa which should draw off annually an amount of that portion of our population equal to its annual increase, much good will be done. . . . Every emigrant to Africa is a missionary carrying with him credentials in the holy cause of civilization, religion, and free institutions.

We are reproached with doing mischief by the agitation of this question. The society goes into no household to disturb its domestic tranquility; it addresses itself to no slaves to weaken their obligations of obedience. It seeks to effect no man's property. It has neither the power nor the will to effect the property of any one contrary to his consent. The execution of its scheme would augment instead of diminishing the value of the property left behind. [On African Colonization].—*Clay's Speeches, Vol. I, pp. 518, 519, 520, 523, 525, 526, 527.*

Clay on the abolitionists:

There are three classes of persons opposed, or apparently opposed to the continued existence of slavery in the United States. . . . And the third class are the real ultra abolitionists, who are resolved to persevere in the pursuit of their object at all hazards, and without regard to any consequences, however calamitous they may be. With them the rights of property are nothing; the deficiency of the powers of the general government are nothing; the acknowledged and incontestable powers of the states are nothing; civil war, a dissolution of the union, and the overthrow of a government in which are concentrated the fondest hopes of the civilized world, are nothing.

* * * *

The next obstacle in the way of abolition, arises out of the fact of the presence in the slave states of three millions of slaves. They are there, dispersed throughout the land, part and parcel of our population. They

were brought in to the country originally under the authority of the parent government, whilst we were colonies, and their importation was continued, in spite of all the remonstrances of our ancestors. If the question were an original question, whether, there being no slaves in the country, we should introduce them, and incorporate them into our society, that would be a totally different question. Few, if any, of the citizens of the United States would be found to favor their introduction. No man in it would oppose, upon that supposition, their admission with more determined resolution and conscientious repugnance than I should. . . . What is best to be done for their happiness and our own? In the slave states the alternative is, that the white man must govern the black, or the black govern the white. . . . [Abolition Petitions].—*Clay's Speeches, Vol. II, pp. 357, 367.*

The relations that existed between Clay and President Jackson are well set forth in the following extracts:

We are in the midst of a revolution, hitherto bloodless, but rapidly tending towards a total change of the pure republican character of the government, and to the concentration of all power in the hands of one man. The powers of congress are paralyzed, except when exerted in conformity with his will, by a frequent and an extraordinary exercise of the executive veto, not anticipated by the founders of our constitution, and not practised by any of the predecessors of the present chief magistrate.—[On the removal of the deposits].

* * * *

The constitutional participation of the senate in the appointing power is virtually abolished by the constant use of the power of removal from office, without any known cause, and by the appointment of the same individual to the same office, after his rejection by the senate. . . . The judiciary has not been exempt from the prevailing rage for innovation. Decisions of the tribunals, deliberately pronounced have been contemptuously disregarded. . . . By the third of March, 1837, if the progress of the innovation continues, there will be scarcely a vestage of the government re-

maining and its policy, as they existed prior to the third of March 1829. In a term of eight years, a little more than equal to that which was required to establish our liberties, the government will have been transformed into an elective monarchy—the worst of all forms of governments. . . . [On the removal of the deposits].

* * * *

For more than fifteen years, Mr. President, I have been struggling to avoid the present state of things. I thought I perceived in some proceedings, during the conduct of the Seminole war, a spirit of defiance to the constitution and to the law. With what sincerity and truth, with what earnestness and devotion to civil liberty, I have struggled, the searcher of all human hearts best knows. With what fortune the bleeding constitution of my country fatally attests. [On the removal of the deposits].—*Clay's Speeches, Vol. VI, pp. 145, 146, 164.*

Clay supposed seemingly in 1842 when he delivered his Farewell Address to the Senate that he was leaving its halls forever. Instead he returned again in 1849, and made some of his most famous speeches in favor of the Compromise of 1850. Space, however, forbids any further extracts.

In retiring, as I am about to do, forever, from the senate, suffer me to express my heartfelt wishes that all the great and patriotic objects of the wise framers of our constitution may be fulfilled. That the high destiny designed for it may be fully answered; and that its deliberations, now and hereafter, may eventuate in s curing the prosperity of our beloved country, in maintaining its rights and honors abroad, and upholding its interests at home. I retire, I know, at a period of infinite distress and embarrassment. I wish I could take my leave of you under more favorable auspices; but, without meaning at this time to say whether on any or on whom reproaches for the sad condition of the country should fall, I appeal to the senate and to the world to bear testimony to my earnest and continued

exertions to avert it, and to the truth that no blame can justly attach to me. [Valedictory address to the senate].—*Clay's Speeches, Vol. XI, p. 568.*

QUESTIONS

1. What was the character of Clay's oratory? (2) Point out some of the reasons that gave him a strong hold on the people. (3) Do you see any traces of egotism? (4) From what class did Clay come? (5) How had the people of Kentucky treated him? (6) Could Clay bear criticism unaffectedly? (7) What question earliest aroused Clay's interest? (8) Outline the arguments he used in favor of protection. (9) What did he name the system? (10) Was the name he chose a good political stroke? (11) How did his arguments differ from those now used? (12) Were his arguments all logical? (13) Were they all consistent with each other?

(1) Trace Clay's position in regard to a national bank. (2) What theory of the Constitution in his first bank speech? (3) Compare it with the theory found in his speech on nullification.

(1) What position did Clay take in regard to acquisition of territory? (2) Would he now, judged by these speeches, be for or against annexation of Cuba, for example? (3) What were his feelings in regard to war? (4) Was he entirely consistent? (5) How did he feel in regard to the war of 1812? (6) Who decide on the constitutionality of laws? (7) What claim did Virginia make in regard to such a decision? (8) What view did Clay hold? (9) What names in history are the two views known by? (10) How did he argue on the South Carolina position?

(1) Show what Clay's feelings were toward Jackson. (2) Can you explain his bitter tone? (3) Have his predictions been in any way fulfilled? (4) May they yet be fulfilled?

(1) Was Clay a lover of popular liberty? (2) Bring together as many extracts to prove your answer as you can. (3) For what purpose does he say the colonization society was formed? (4) What did he assert was the character of the free negroes? (5) Why did he claim they ought to be sent back to Africa? (6) Are his two assertions consistent? (7) Why does he wish the free negroes removed? (8) Were his remarks in regard to the negroes consistent with his speech on Greek liberty? (9) Did Clay desire emancipation of the slaves?

(1) Judged by these extracts do you consider Clay a deep thinker or not? (2) Write a life of Clay from these extracts.

DANIEL WEBSTER

Born in New Hampshire, 1782. Member of House of Representatives, 1813-1817, 1823-1827. Senator, 1827-1841, 1845-1850. Candidate for President, 1836. Secretary of state, 1841-1843, 1850-1852. Debate with Clay on tariff, 1824. Webster-Hayne debate, 1830. Webster-Calhoun debate, 1833. Great "Seventh of March" speech, 1850. Died, 1852.

CHAPTER IV

DANIEL WEBSTER

THE names of Clay and Webster are so intimately associated in American history that one name is rarely mentioned unless it is accompanied by the other. A third name is usually joined with theirs; in many ways the antithesis of both. It is fitting, therefore, that this study, following the one on Clay should deal with Webster. It will be no less proper that Calhoun should come before us for our next study.

Webster was five years the junior of Clay. Born on a farm in New Hampshire, his early years were scarcely more favorable than Clay's. However, he had a father who was ready to sacrifice for him, so he was able to obtain a college education, graduating at Dartmouth in 1800 (?) the recognized leader in composition and public speaking of his class.

As in the case of Clay, the mass of material from which to select in his manhood years is so rich that its wealth overwhelms one when he attempts to choose. There are also quite a large number of youthful letters accessible, so it would be possible to let Webster tell the story of his own life from an early time; but as it could only be done by the omission of more interesting, or, at least, more important, matter from his public life, it has been thought best to incorporate but few extracts here.

PART I

EXTRACTS MADE FROM WEBSTER'S PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE, EDITION 1857, COMPILED BY HIS SON, FLETCHER WEBSTER

I believe I made tolerable progress in most branches which I attended to, while in this school; but there was one thing I could not do. I could not make a declamation. I could not speak before the school. The kind and excellent Buckminster sought, especially, to persuade me to perform the exercise of declamation, like other boys; but I could not do it.—*Autobiography.*

With respect to Daniel Webster's college life, his habits of study were good. He was a strict observer of order. His mind was too dignified to do otherwise. He never engaged in college disturbances.—*Rev. E. Smith, 1852.*

"Ay," said he, "but the opinion of my scholarship was a mistaken one. It was overestimated. I will explain what I mean. Many other students read more than I did and knew more than I did. But so much as I read, I made my own. When a half hour or an hour had elapsed, I closed my book and thought over what I had read. If there was anything peculiarly interesting or striking in the passage, I endeavored to recall it and lay it up in my memory, and commonly effected my object.—*Letter of McGaw, 1852.*

Webster was never an idle student, as some persons falsely and erroneously believe. I have often been questioned on that subject, and have always taken upon myself the pleasing task of promptly denying the charge and correcting the mistake.—*Letter of Mr. Hotchkiss, 1852.*

[1800] I have read Robertson, Vattel, and three volumes of Blackstone, and a little miscellaneous stuff of no account. I hope to go on more rapidly now, for I feel more at ease than I have done heretofore.

[1802] I have now by me two cents in lawful federal currency; next week I will send them, if they be all; they will buy a pipe; with a pipe you can smoke, smoking inspires wisdom; wisdom is allied to fortitude; from fortitude it is but one step to stoicism; and stoi-

cism never pants for this world's goods; so perhaps my two cents, by this process, may put you quite at ease about cash. Write me this minute, if you can; tell me all your necessities; no, not all, a part only, and anything else you can think of to amuse me.

[1803] A man can never gallop over the fields of law on Pegasus, nor fly across them on the wing of oratory. If he would stand on terra firma he must descend; if he would be a great lawyer, he must first consent to be only a great drudge.

[1804] The contagion of democracy will prevade every place and corrupt every generous and manly sentiment. It cannot be successfully resisted. The pestilence will spread in a favorable state of the atmosphere, notwithstanding all the medical exertions of the most skillful physicians.

[1804] It were much easier for me to form connections than to support them. There are many young men of my own age with whom it would be easy to associate; but a young man who has a fortune to spend, is not a proper companion for another who has a fortune to make.

[1813] We shall probably get up some resolutions, directly attacking the war. If so, I suppose I shall shoot my little gun. We have some fine fellows on our side of the House.

[1816] The events of the times, the policy of England, the consequences of our war, and the Ghent Treaty, have bereft us of our commerce, the great source of our wealth. If any great scenes are to be acted in this country within the next twenty years, New York is the place in which those scenes are to be viewed. More of this hereafter.

[1823] DEAR DANIEL,—I received yours this morning. Of all the candidates named for the Presidency, the people of New Hampshire would undoubtedly prefer Mr. Adams. Mr. Adams being out of the question, I think Mr. Calhoun would be their choice. I think neither Jackson, Crawford, nor Clay could ever obtain the votes of this state.—[*N. H.*]

[1823] Many of the Federalists in the western district, it is supposed, favor Mr. Adams; otherwise, in the city and its neighborhood.

[1824] I hope all New England will support Mr. Calhoun for the Vice-Presidency. If so, he will probably be chosen, and that will be a great thing. He is a true man, and will do good to the country in that situation.

[1824] The tariff will not pass the Senate without great amendment.

We have struck a mortal blow on the tariff principle. If it were not for instruction and other nonsense, two-thirds nearly of our House would be against it.

[1829] General Jackson will be here about 15th February. . . .

My opinion is, that when he comes he will bring a breeze with him. Which way it will blow I cannot tell.

[1832] Mr. Calhoun, as you are doubtless aware, has published a labored defence of nullification, in the form of a letter, to Governor Hamilton. It is far the ablest and most plausible, and therefore the most dangerous vindication of that particular form of revolution, which has yet appeared.

In the silence of abler pens, and seeing as I think I do, that the affairs of this government are rapidly approaching a crisis, I have felt it to be my duty to answer Mr. Calhoun.

[1835] You express a wish, however, that for the satisfaction of friends in other parts of the state, I should enable you to make known my sentiments respecting the order of Free masonry. I have no hesitation, gentlemen, in saying that, however unobjectionable may have been the original objects of the institution, or however pure may be the motives and purposes of individual members, and notwithstanding the many great and good men who have from time to time belonged to the order, yet, nevertheless, it is an institution, which, in my judgment, is essentially wrong in the principal of its formation; that, from its very nature, it is liable to great abuses; that among the obligations which are found to be imposed on its members, there are such as are entirely incompatible with the duty of good citizens; and that all secret associations, the members of which take upon themselves extraordinary obligations to one another, and are bound together by secret

oaths, are, naturally, sources of jealousy and just alarm to others; are especially unfavorable to harmony and mutual confidence among men, living together under popular institutions; and are dangerous to the general cause of civil liberty and good government. Under the influence of this conviction, I heartily approved the law, lately enacted in the State of which I am a citi zen, for abolishing all such oaths and obligations

[1838] I entertain no doubt whatever that Congress have full authority to regulate slavery within the said District, or abolish it altogether; . . .

More than all, it is my opinion, "that the citizens of the United States have an unquestionable constitutional right to petition Congress for the restraint or abolition of slavery and the slave trade within the said District; . . .

[1840] I see, too, that the money crisis is not over in England. Our concerns are indeed much connected, and the same causes affect them all. I am coming to the opinion fast, that new modes of regulation must be adopted in both countries, or else the frequent contraction and expansion of the paper circulation will compel us to give it up, and go back to gold or iron, or the Lord knows what.

[1840] The question of accepting a seat in your cabinet, should it be tendered to me, has naturally been the subject of my reflections and consultation with friends. The result of these reflections and consultations has been that I should accept the office of the Secretary of State, should it be offered to me, under circumstances such as now exist.

[1841] The Senate yesterday engrossed a bill for a bank Its shape is the result of many compromises, but it may still be doubtful whether it will become a law. Probably it may pass both Houses, but whether the President will approve it, is a question which I hardly dare ask myself. If he should not, I know not what will become of our administration.

[1842] Of one thing I am glad, and that is, that I am out of Congress. I liked Congress very much, formerly; very much; but men and things, habits, tempers, principles, all have changed. My present situation would be pleasant enough, if all things were right. But I do not mean to turn grumbler.

[1844] I maintained in that speech that duties could not be laid by treaty, because the imposition of duties appropriately belongs to Congress, and especially to the House of Representatives, and I now maintain that the two Houses cannot by majority ratify treaties, because the treaty-making power belongs exclusively to the President and Senate.

[1845] While we feel as we ought about the annexation of Texas, we ought to keep in view the true grounds of objection to that measure. Those grounds are, want of constitutional power, danger of too great an extent of territory, and opposition to the increase of slavery, and slave representation.

[1850] It is a strange and a melancholy fact, that not one single national speech has been made in the House of Representatives this session. Every man speaks to defend himself, and to gratify his own constituents. That is all. No one inquires how the Union is to be preserved, and the peace of the country restored. Meantime all important public measures are worse than stationary. The tariff, for instance, is losing important friends through the irritation produced by these slavery debates. I suppose no history shows a case of such mischiefs arising from angry debates and disputes, both in the government and the country, on questions of so very little real importance.

[1850] You have heard how all things have gone, so far. I confess I feel relieved. Since the 7th of March, there has not been an hour in which I have not felt a "crushing" weight of anxiety and responsibility. I have gone to sleep at night, and waked in the morning with the same feeling of eating care. And I have set down to no breakfast or dinner to which I have brought an unconcerned and easy mind. It is over. My part is acted, and I am satisfied. The rest I leave to stronger bodies and fresher minds.

[1850] For your sake, however, I will say, that my public speeches show my opinion to have been decidedly in favor of a proper, efficient, and well-guarded law, for the recovery of fugitive slaves.

[1851] If I have endeavored to defend and uphold the Union of the United States, it is because my fixed

judgment and my unalterable affections have impelled me, and still impel me, to regard that Union as the only security for general prosperity and national glory. Yes, Gentleman, the Constitution and the Union! I place them together. If they stand, they must stand together; if they fall they must fall together.

Vol. I, page 9, 45, 51, 66, 100, 123, 151, 175, 194, 236, 256, 323, 329, 347, 350, 467, 526; Vol. II, pp, 13, 32, 75, 93, 106, 144, 196, 204, 369, 385, 402, 424.

PART II.

Soon after Webster entered Congress he began his pleas for the Union: here is an early example:

What else is it, but the unrestrained and free operation of that same Federal Constitution, which it has been proposed now to hamper, and manacle, and nullify? Who is there among us, that, should he find himself on any spot of the earth where human beings exist, and where the existence of other nations is known, would not be proud to say, I am an American? I am a countryman of Washington? I am a citizen of that republic, which, although it has suddenly sprung up, yet there are none on the globe who have ears to hear, and have not heard of it; who have eyes to see, and have not read of it; who knows anything, and yet do not know of its existence and its glory?—*Webster's Works, Vol. I, p. 205.*

In combatting the views of some men in Congress in regard to the management of the public lands, he said:—

[Land System] Yet, of late years, an idea has been suggested, indeed seriously advanced, *that these lands, of right, belong to the States respectively in which they happen to lie.* This doctrine, Sir, which, I perceive, strikes this assembly as being somewhat extravagant, is founded on an argument derived, as is supposed, from the nature of State sovereignty. It has been openly espoused, by candidates for office, in some of the new States, and, indeed, has been announced in the Senate of the United States.—*Webster's Works, Vol. I, p. 250.*

Webster discusses the Freedom of the Press in the following extracts in a characteristic manner:

In all popular governments a FREE PRESS is the most important of all agents and instruments.

.

The conductors of the press, in popular governments, occupy a place, in the social and political system of the very highest consequence. They wear the character of public instructors. Their daily labors bear directly on the intelligence, the morals the tastes, and the public spirit of the country. Not only are they journalists, recording political occurrences, but they discuss principles, they comment on measures, they canvass characters; they hold the power over the reputation, the feelings, the happiness, of individuals.

.

But remember, Sir, that these are the attributes of a FREE PRESS only. And is a press that is purchased or pensioned more free than a press that is fettered? Can the people look for truths to partial sources, whether rendered partial through fear or through favor? Why shall not a manacled press be trusted with the maintenance and defense of popular rights? Because it is supposed to be under the influence of a power which may prove greater than the love of truth. —*Webster's Works. Vol. I, p. 264.*

In a speech before the National Republican Convention, October 12, 1832, he treated of nullification in these words, in part:

Mr. President, I shall not discuss the doctrine of nullification. I am sure it can have no friends here. Gloss it and disguise it as we may, it is a pretense incompatible with the authority of the Constitution. If direct separation be not its only mode of operation, separation is, nevertheless, its direct consequence. That a state may nullify a law of the Union and still remain *in* the Union; that she may have Senators and Representatives in the government, and yet be at liberty to disobey and resist that government; that she may partake in the common councils and yet not be bound by their results; that she may control a law of

congress, so that it shall be one thing with her, while it is another thing with the rest of the States;—all these propositions seem to me so absolutely at war with common sense and reason, that I do not understand how any intelligent person can yield the slightest assent to them Nullification . . is dissolution; it is dismemberment: it is the breaking up of the Union.—*Webster, Works, Vol. I, p. 173.*

In the last number of the MONTHLY a quotation was given to show Clay's views on the Greek cause. Here are Webster's resolutions, and a few extracts from his speech:

On the assembling of Congress in December, 1823, President Monroe made the revolution in Greece the subject of a paragraph in his annual message and on the 8th of December Mr. Webster moved the following resolution in the House of Representatives:

"Resolved, That provision ought to be made, by law, for defraying the expense incident to the appointment of an Agent or Commissioner to Greece whenever the President shall deem it expedient to make such appointment."

These, it is believed, are the first official expressions favorable to the independence of Greece uttered by any of the Governments of Christendom, and no doubt contributed powerfully towards the creation of that feeling throughout the civilized world which eventually led to the battle of Navarino and a liberation of a portion of Greece from the Turkish yoke. . . . It is believed that the whole world takes a deep interest in their welfare. Although no power has declared in their favor, yet none, according to our information has taken part against them. Their cause and their name have protected them from dangers which might ere this have overwhelmed any other people. It is certainly true that the just policy of this country is, in the first place, a peaceful policy. No nation ever had less to expect from forcible aggrandizement. In the next place I take it that the policy of this country, springing from the nature of our government and the spirit of all our institutions is, so far as it respects the interesting questions which

agitate the present age on the side of liberty and enlightened sentiments. It cannot be denied that the great political question of this age is that between absolute and regulated governments. . . . This asserted right of forcible intervention in the affairs of other nations is in open violation of the public law of the world. Who has authorized these learned doctors of Troppau to establish new articles in this code? Whence are their diplomas? Is the whole world supposed to acquiesce in principles which entirely subvert the independence of nations? On the basis of this independence has been reared the beautiful fabric of inter-national law. I think it is sufficient answer to this to say that we are one of the nations of the earth; that we have an interest therefore, in the preservation of that system of national law and national intercourse, which has heretofore subsisted, so beneficially for all. It may, in the next place, be asked, perhaps, Supposing all this to be true what can WE do? Are we to go to war? Are we to interfere in the Greek cause or any other European cause? Are we to endanger our pacific relations? No, certainly not. . . . Sir, this reasoning mistakes the age. The time has been indeed, when fleets, armies, and subsidies, were the principal reliances even in the best cause. But happily for mankind, a great change has taken place in this respect. Moral causes come into consideration in proportion as the progress of knowledge is advanced; and the public opinion of the civilized world is rapidly gaining an ascendancy over mere brutal force. . . .

. . . The Greeks address the civilized world with a pathos not easy to be resisted. They invoke our favor by more moving considerations than can well belong to the condition of any other people. They stretch out their arms to the Christian communities of the earth, beseeching them by a generous recognition of their ancestors, by the consideration of their desolated and ruined cities and villages, by their wives and children sold into an accursed slavery, by their blood which they seem willing to pour out like water, by the common faith, and in the name, which unites all Christians, that they would extend to them at least some token of

compassionate regard.—*Webster, Works Vol. III, pp. 60, 63, 64, 65, 74, 75, 77, 92-93.*

The nature of the Union as defined and described by Webster, January 26, 1830:

There remains yet to be performed, Mr. President, by far the most grave and important duty, which I feel to be devolved on me by this occasion. It is to state, and to defend, what I conceive to be the true principles of the Constitution under which we are here assembled. I might well have desired that so weighty a task should have fallen into other and abler hands.

I understand the honorable gentleman from South Carolina to maintain, that it is a right of the State legislatures to interfere, whenever, in their judgment this government transcends its constitutional limits, and to arrest the operation of the laws.

I understand him to maintain this right, as a right existing under the Constitution, not as a right to overthrow on the ground of extreme necessity, such as would justify violent revolution.

.

I understand him to maintain, that the ultimate power of judging of the constitutional extent of its own authority is not lodged exclusively in the general government, or any branch of it; but that, on the contrary, the States may lawfully decide for themselves, and each State, for itself, whether, in a given case, the act of the general government transcends its power.

I understand him to insist, that, if the exigency of the case, in the opinion of any state government, require it, such state government may, by its own sovereign authority, annul an act of the general government which it deems plainly and palpably unconstitutional.

.

Allow me to say, . . . that I call this the South Carolina doctrine only because the gentleman himself has so demonstrated it. I do not feel at liberty to say that South Carolina as a state, has ever advanced these sentiments. I hope she has not, and never may.—*Webster's Works, Vol. III, pp. 317, 318.*

This leads us to inquire into the origin of this government and the source of its power. Whose agent is

it? Is it a creation of the State legislatures, or the creation of the people?

If the government of the United States be the agent of the State governments, then they may control it; . . . if it be the agent of the people, then the people alone can control it, restrain it, modify, or reform it.

.

It is, Sir, the people's Constitution, the people's government, made for the people, made by the people, and answerable to the people. The people of the United States have declared that this Constitution shall be the supreme law.—*Ibid., Vol. III, p. 321.*

If there be no power to settle such questions, independent of either of the States, is not the whole Union a rope of sand? Are we not thrown back again, precisely, upon the old Confederation.

It is too plain to be argued. Four-and-twenty interpreters of constitutional law, each with a power to decide for itself, and none with authority to bend any body else, and this constitutional law the only bond of their union! What is such a state of things but a mere connection during pleasure, or, to use the phraseology of the times, *during feeling?* And that feeling, too, not the feeling of the people, who established the Constitution, but the feeling of the State governments. —*Ibid., Vol. III, p. 324.*

For myself, Sir, I do not admit competency of South Carolina, or any other State, to prescribe my constitutional duty; or to settle, between me and the people, the validity of laws of Congress, for which I have voted.

.

To avoid all possibility of being misunderstood, allow me to repeat again, in the fullest manner, that I claim no powers for the government by forced or unfair construction. I admit that it is a government of strictly limited powers; of enumerated, specified, and particularized powers; and whatsoever is not granted, is withheld.—*Ibid., Vol. III, p. 336.*

Webster prepared a bill on the Appointment and Removal of government officials; these extracts from his speech in support of the bill indicate his views on the question:

Mr. President. The professed object of this bill is the reduction of executive influence and patronage. I concur in the propriety of that object. Having no wish to diminish or control, in the slightest degree, the constitutional and legal authority of the presidential office, yet I think the indirect and rapidly increasing influence which it possesses and which arises from the power of bestowing office and taking it away again at pleasure, and from the manner in which that power seems now to be systematically exercised is productive of serious evils. The unlimited power to grant office and to take it away, gives a command over the hopes and fears of a vast multitude of men. It is generally true that he who controls another man's means of living controls his will. . . . The existence of parties in popular governments is not to be avoided; and if they are formed on constitutional questions, or in regard to great measures of public policy, and do not run to excessive length it may be admitted that on the whole, they do no great harm. But the patronage of office, the power of bestowing place and emoluments creates parties, not upon any principle or any measure but upon the single ground of personal interest. Under the direct influence of this motive they form round a leader, and they go for the "spoils of victory." And if the party chieftain becomes the national chieftain, he is still but too apt to consider, all who have opposed him as enemies to be punished and all who have supported him as friends to be rewarded. Blind devotion to party, and to the head of a party, thus takes the place of the sentiment of generous patriotism and a high and exalted sense of public duty. . . . Does he not behold, every hour, a stronger development of the principle of personal attachment and a corresponding diminution of genuine and generous public feeling? . . . Sir, the theory of our institutions is plain, it is, that government is an agency created for the good of the people and that every person in office is an agent and servant of the people. . . . The second check on executive patronage contained in this bill is of still greater importance than the first. This provision is, that; whenever the president removes any of these officers from office, he shall state to the senate the

reasons for such removal. This part of the bill has been opposed, both on constitutional grounds and grounds of expediency . . . I think then, Sir, that the power of appointment naturally and necessarily includes the power of removal, where no limitation is expressed, nor any tenure but that at will declared. The power of appointment being conferred on the president and Senate, I think the power of removal went along with it, and exercised by the same hands. I think consequently that the decision of 1789, which *implied* a power of removal separate from the appointing power was erroneous.

From Webster's Works, Vol. IV, Speech "Appointing and Removing Power," made in U. S. Senate February 16, 1835.—*Webster's Works, Vol. IV, pp. 178-198.*

In Webster's speech on the Bank Charter of 1834 he outlines very well his financial views, and discusses the relation of banks to public credit:

Mr. President, in the midst of ample means of national and individual happiness, we have, unexpectedly, fallen into severe distress. Our course has been suddenly arrested. The general pulse of life stands still, and the activity and industry of the country feels a pause. . . The condition of the country is, indeed, singular. It is like that of a strong man chained. In full health, with strength unabated, and all its faculties unimpaired, it is yet incapable of performing its accustomed action. Fetters and manacles are on its limbs. . . . It is often inquired how this enormous amount of evil could spring from a cause apparently so inadequate to produce it. Can it be possible, it is asked, that the Secretary has brought about all this distress simply by removing a few millions of dollars out of one bank into other banks? . . . Every commercial country has one great representative constantly passing and acting between all its citizens. This universal representative is, credit, or money, in some form as its substitute. . . And all the distress which the country now suffers arises solely from acts which have deranged the currency of the country and the credit of the commercial com-

munity. The country is as rich in its general appearance, as it was before the experiment was begun; that is to say, men have the same houses, lands, ships and merchandise. But the value of these has fallen; or, to speak more correctly, they have lost the power of being exchanged, and they have lost this power because of the embarrasment which has befallen the general medium of exchange. . . . The secretary disturbed this state of peace. He broke up all the harmony of the system. By suddenly withdrawing all the public moneys from the Bank of the United States, he forced that bank to an immediate correspondent curtailment of its loans and discounts. . . . I hold the immediate convertibility of bank notes into specie to be an indispensable security for their retaining their value. . . . This commercial credit, Sir, depends on wise laws, steadily administered. Indeed, the best governed countries are always the richest. . . . The history of banks belongs to the history of commerce and the general history of liberty. . . . In what instance have they endangered liberty or overcome the laws? This very existence, on the contrary, depends on the rule of both liberty and law. . . . It is felt, by every one, that this is a case in which the acts of the government come directly home to him, and produce either good or evil, every hour, upon his personal and private condition. And how is this public expectation met? How is this intense, this agonized expectation answered. I am grieved to say. I am ashamed to say, it is answered by declamations against the bank as a monster, by loud cries against a moneyed aristocracy, by pretended zeal for a hard money system and by professions of favor and regard to the poor. The poor! We are waging war for the benefit of the poor! We slay the monster, the bank, that we may defeat the unjust purposes of the rich, and elevate and protect the poor. And what is the effect of all this? What happens to the poor, and all the middling classes in consequence of this warfare? Where are they? Are they well fed, well clothed, well employed, independent, happy and grateful? They are all at the feet of the capitalists, they are in the jaws of usury. Sir, let the system of the Administration go on and we

shall soon not know our country. We shall see a new America. On the map where these United States have stood, we shall behold a country that is new to us. We shall see a class of idle rich, and a class of idle poor, the former a handful, the latter a host . . . The truth is that banks, everywhere, and especially with us, are made for the borrowers. They are made for the good of the many and not for the good of the few. Even their ownership, to a great extent, is in the hands of men of moderate property. . . . Indeed, Sir, I think it time, high time, that there should be a pause in this outcry against the bank, as dangerous in its political power, or as favoring wealth in its accumulation rather than in its distribution. Prejudice excited against the bank is a much more powerful political engine than the bank itself. It is more than a match for ten banks.—*Webster's Works, Vol. IV, p. 82–95.*

Towards the close of his life he still emphasized the idea of Union as these extracts show; from a speech in the Senate, March 23, 1848.

In that little part which I have acted in public life, it has been my purpose to maintain the people of the United States, what the Constitution designed to make them, *one people*, one in interest one in character, and one in political feeling. If we depart from that, we break it all up. . . .

Arbitrary governments may have territories and distant possessions, because arbitrary governments may rule them by different laws and different systems, . . . We can do no such thing. They must be of us, *part* of us, or else strangers.

I think I see that in progress which will disfigure and deform the Constitution. While these territories remain territories, they will be a trouble and an annoyance; they will draw after them vast expenses; . . .

I think I see a course adopted which is likely to turn the Constitution of the land into a deformed monster, into a curse rather than a blessing; in fact, a frame of an unequal government, not founded upon popular representation, not founded upon equality, but on the grossest inequality; and I think that this process will go

on, or that there is *danger* that it will go on, until this Union shall fall to pieces. I resist it, to-day and all ways! Whoever falters or whoever flies, I continue the contest! *Webster's Works, Vol. V, p. 300. Speech delivered in the Senate, March 23, 1848.*

The annexation of foreign territory was discussed by Webster. His general position may be understood from these extracts:

. . . And how is it with California. We propose to take California, from the forty-second degree of north latitude down to the thirty-second. . . . But if, just about San Francisco, and perhaps Monterey, emigrants enough should settle to make up one State, then the people five hundred miles off would have another State. And so this disproportion of the Senate to the people will go on, and must go on, and we cannot prevent it. I say, Sir, that, according to my conscientious conviction, we are now fixing on the Constitution of the United States, and its frame of government, a monstrosity, a disfiguration, an enormity! Sir, I hardly dare trust myself. I don't know but I may be under some delusion. It may be the weakness of my eyes that forms this monstrous apparition. . . .

But then, Sir, what relieves the case of this enormity? What is our reliance? Why, it is that we stipulate that these new States shall be brought in at a suitable time. And pray, what is to constitute the suitableness of time? Who is to judge of it? I tell you, Sir, that suitable time will come when the preponderance of party power here makes it necessary to bring in the new States."—*Webster's Works, Vol. V, p. 291–292.*

My first agency in matters of this kind was upon the proposition for admitting Texas into the Union. That I thought it my duty to oppose, upon the general ground of opposing all formation of new States out of foreign territory, and, I may add, and I ought to add in justice, of States in which slaves were to be represented in the Congress of the United States.—*Ibid., Vol. V, p. 286.*

But it is said we must take territory for the sake of peace. We must take territory. It is the will of the President. If we do not take what he offers, we may

fare worse. Mr. Polk will take no less, that he is fixed upon. He is immovable. He—has—put—down—his—foot! Well, Sir, he put it down upon "fifty-four forty," but it didn't stay. I speak of the President, as of all Presidents, without disrespect. I know of no reason why his opinion and his will, his purpose, declared to be final, should control us, . . .—*Ibid., Vol. V, p. 282.*

I have said I would rather have no peace for the present, than have a peace which brings territory for new States; and the reason is, that we shall get peace as soon without territory as with it, more safe, more durable, and vastly more honorable to us, the great republic of the world.

But we hear gentlemen say, we must have some territory, the people demand it. I deny it; at least, I see no proof of it whatever.—*Ibid., Vol. V, p. 281.*

Sir, I fear we are not yet arrived at the beginning of the end. I pretend to see but little of the future, and that little affords no gratification. All I can scan is contention, strife, and agitation. Before we obtain a perfect right to conquered territory, there must be a cession. A cession can only be made by treaty. No treaty can pass the Senate, till the Constitution is overthrown, without the consent of two-thirds of its members. Now who can shut his eyes to the great probability of a successful resistance to any treaty of cession, from one quarter of the Senate or another? Will the North consent to a treaty bringing in territory subject to slavery? Will the South consent to a treaty bringing in territory from which slavery is excluded? Sir, the future is full of difficulties and full of dangers. We are suffering to pass the golden opportunity for securing harmony and the stability of the Constitution. We appear to me to be rushing upon perils headlong, and with our eyes wide open. But I put my trust in Providence, and in that good sense and patriotism of the people, which will yet, I hope, be awakened before it is too late.—*Ibid., Vol V, p. 261.*

In arguing on the tariff, July, 1846, he said, in part:

The Northwestern States are destined to be manufacturing States. They have iron and coal. They

have a people of laborious habits. They have already capital enough to begin works such as belong to new States and new communities; and when the time comes, and it cannot but come soon, they will see their true interest to be, to feed the Northern and Eastern manufacturers, as far as they may require it, and in the mean time begin to vary their own occupations, by having classes of men amongst them who are not of the now universal agricultural population. The sooner they begin this work the better; and begin it they will, because they are an intelligent and active people, and cannot fail to see in what direction their true interest lies.—*Webster's Works, Vol. V, p. 233.*

In a letter to Mr. Bolton, of Georgia, in 1833, Webster uses this language in regard to slavery:

In my opinion, the domestic slavery of the Southern States is a subject within the exclusive control of the States themselves; and this, I am sure, is the opinion of the whole North. Congress has no authority to interfere in the emancipation of slaves, or in the treatment of them in any of the States. This was so resolved in the House of Representatives, when Congress sat in this City in 1790, on the report of a committee consisting almost entirely of Northern members; and I do not know an instance of the expression of a different opinion, in either house of Congress, since. The servitude of so great a portion of the population of the South is undoubtedly regarded at the North as a great evil, moral and political; and the discussions upon it which have recently taken place in the legislatures of several of the slaveholding States have been read with very deep interest. But it is regarded, nevertheless, as an evil, the remedy for which lies with those legislatures themselves, to be provided and applied according to their own sense of policy and duty.—*Webster's Works, Vol. VI, p. 536.*

In 1850, in regard to the danger to the Union from the slavery question, he said:

These consequences I willingly meet, these dangers I encounter without hesitation; being resolved to

throw myself, with whatever weight may belong to me, unreservedly into the scale of UNION. Where Washington led, I am willing to follow, at a vast distance, indeed, and with unequal, but no faltering steps.—*Webster's Works, Vol. VI, p. 550.*

With a few extracts from Webster's famous "Seventh of March" speech, our little picture of Webster must be called finished:

I wish to speak to-day, not as a Massachusetts man, nor as a Northern man, but as an American, and a member of the Senate of the United States. . . . It is not to be denied that we live in the midst of strong agitations, and surrounded by very considerable dangers to our institutions and government. The imprisoned winds are let loose. The East, the North, and the stormy South combine to throw the whole sea into commotion, to toss its billows to the skies, and disclose its profoundest depths. Now, Sir, upon the general nature and influence of slavery there exists a wide difference of opinion between the northern portion of this country and the southern. It is said on the one side, that . . . slavery is a wrong; that it is founded merely in the right of the strongest; . . . [In the South.] There are thousands of religious men, with consciences as tender as any of their brethren at the North, who do not see the unlawfulness of slavery: . . . But we must view things as they are. Slavery does exist in the United States. It did exist in the States before the adoption of this Constitution, and at that time. . . .

Now, as to California and New Mexico, I hold slavery to be excluded from those territories by a law even superior to that which admits and sanctions it in Texas. I mean the law of nature, of physical geography, the law of the formation of the earth. . . . I should be unwilling to receive from the legislature of Massachusetts any instructions to present resolutions expressive of any opinion whatever on the subject of slavery, . . ., for two reasons: first, because I do not consider that the legislature of Massachusetts has anything to do with it; and next, because I do not consider that I, as her representative here, have anything to do with it. . . .

Then, Sir, there are the Abolition societies, of which I am unwilling to speak, but in regard to which I have very clear notions and opinions. I do not think them useful. I think their operations for the last twenty years have produced nothing good or valuable. . . .

I hear with distress and anguish the word "secession," especially when it falls from the lips of those who are patriotic, and known to the country, and known all over the world, for their political services. Secession! Peaceable secession! Sir, your eyes and mine are never destined to see that miracle. . . . A voluntary separation, without alimony on one side and on the other. Why? What would be the result? Where is the line to be drawn? What States are to secede? What is to remain American? What am I to be? An American no longer? Where is the flag of the republic to remain?

And now, Mr. President, instead of speaking of the possibility or utility of secession, instead of dwelling in those caverns of darkness, instead of groping with those ideas so full of all that is horrid and horrible, let us come out into the light of day; let us enjoy the fresh air of Liberty and Union; let us cherish those hopes that belong to us; let us devote ourselves to those great objects that are fit for our consideration and our action; let us raise our conceptions to the magnitude and the importance of the duties that devolve upon us; let our comprehension be as broad as the country for which we act, our aspirations as high as its certain destiny; let us not be pigmies in a case that calls for men.—*Webster's Works, Vol. V, pp. 325, 330, 333, 350, 356, 357, 361, 365.*

QUESTIONS

(1) What peculiar point do you notice in the first extract? (2) What is said of Webster as a student? (3) What was his method of work? (4) What does he lay down as a rule necessary to follow for success? (5) How did he regard democracy in the early years of his public life? (6) How did he regard Calhoun? (7) How Adams? (8) Whom did the Federalists support for president? (9) What did Webster think about the tariff? (10) Did Webster understand Jackson? (11) What did Webster think of Free Masonry? Why? (12) Write an essay about Webster basing it upon the extracts from his private letters.

(1) For what thought especially does Webster stand in American politics? (2) Bring together all the expressions that prove your conclusion. (3) What doctrine did he combat in regard to the public lands? (4) Why? Can you expand upon his argument? (5) What position did he take in regard to the press? (6) In what ways may it be corrupted? (7) What do you think in regard to the duty of newspapers? (8) What remedy would Webster suggest?

(1) What arguments did Webster use in regard to the doctrine of nullification? (2) Trace his arguments in regard to the nature of the Constitution. (3) Whom did he mean by "the people"? (4) Compare his arguments for the Constitution with Clay's.

(1) Analyze Webster's speech on Greece. (2) Compare it with Clay's. (3) Which was the more eloquent? (4) Which one the more argumentative? (5) What leading thought had each in mind?

(1) Discuss Webster's views about the appointing power. (2) About the right to remove offices. (3) What evils did he find in the method then practiced? (4) What was his remedy? (5) Would the remedy have led to other evils, in your opinion? (6) What did Webster believe in regard to a national bank? (7) State his opinion in regard to the causes of the crisis of 1834. (8) Can you find an expression in his private letters that seems to contradict his public speech on this question? (9) What was to be the result of the destruction of the Bank? (10) Was his prediction verified?

(1) What did Webster believe in regard to slavery? (2) In regard to the rights of the slave master? (3) In regard to the rights of the states over slavery? (4) In regard to the rights of the United States over slavery? (5) How would he settle the issue? (6) Was his idea practical? (7) Did his "Seventh of March" speech have a different tone from earlier speeches?

(1) What did he think about annexing new territory? (2) State his arguments. (3) Would they be applicable now? (4) Were he living would he probably support or oppose the annexation of the Philippines? (5) Choose the passages you believe justify your conclusion.

(1) What passage do you believe to be his most eloquent one? Why? (2) Make out a series of "outlines," one for each topic treated.

JOHN CALDWELL CALHOUN

Born in South Carolina, 1782. Member of state legislature, 1807-1811. Member of House of Representatives, 1811-1817. Secretary of war, 1817-1825. Vice-President, 1825-1830. Senator, 1830-1844. Secretary of state, 1844-1845. Senator, 1845-1850. Famous articles on nullification, 1828-1832. Great speech, March 4, 1850. Died, 1850.

CHAPTER V

JOHN CALDWELL CALHOUN

IN the two preceding numbers, we have studied the lives and works of two of our great national statesmen. In this number we have brought before us the greatest of all the States Rights' men. Calhoun began life as a supporter of the national idea. He never ceased to love the Union, and died, I believe, hoping that the impossible might yet be achieved—the continued association of two opposing principles in the same nation. In one sense Calhoun was never a secessionist. He argued that simple justice should be done the South; and this could be done, he asserted, by allowing to that section the right to settle its own local questions. Perhaps he did not see that he was asking the North to cease thinking and willing; it was to have no opinion in regard to the character of slavery. To him the Constitution meant that the North had no right to have or at least to express an opinion on the subject. The whole question had been, by the Constitution, left with the states. Each state was free to act for itself as it pleased. As far as *action* was concerned, Webster, Clay, and even Lincoln agreed with him. Calhoun, however, held that expressing opinions, calling slavery a wrong or a sin, was also within the prohibition. Here we come upon the insoluble

phase of the question. Yet when all has been said for Calhoun, it is doubtless true that he was a powerful factor in developing the events which led to secession. Slavery was a necessity; the Union was not. If slavery could not continue in the Union, then the Union must fall.

The speech, of March 4, 1850, the last words almost of Calhoun, show that he yet believed that both could continue; and, when less than a month later he passed away, it was with the hope that the result which he saw so plainly under certain conditions might not come to pass. Certainly he thought "the two sections will do justice to each other, and the Union can thus continue."

So large a part of the public life of Calhoun was intimately connected with slavery and the nature of the Union that I have let these two ideas dominate in the selections chosen.

There were no quotable letters accessible for Calhoun's earlier years, nor for his private life. A few words, therefore, about him may be necessary here.

His father was born in Ireland of Scotch-Irish stock, but came to this country when a lad. In 1770 he married Miss Caldwell of a Virginia family. When Calhoun was thirteen years old his father died, leaving him to the care of his mother. He was raised on a small plantation, and as his health was rather delicate and means not abundant, he did not start to college until he was nineteen. He graduated at Yale, however, four years later, and after three years study of law, began its practice at twenty-six. Before he was thirty he was prominent in the politics of his state, and

soon became not only its leader, but also one of the foremost statesmen of his time.

The following extracts from his speech in Congress of December 12, 1811, will show his position on the war of 1812, and incidentally his views about the powers of the Federal government:

I understood the opinion of the Committee on Foreign Relations, differently from what the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Randolph) has stated to be his impression. I certainly understood that the committee recommended the measures now before the House, as a preparation for war; . . . Indeed, the report could mean nothing but war or empty menace. I hope no member of this House is in favor of the latter. A bullying, menacing system, has everything to condemn and nothing to recommend it. In expense, it almost rivals war. It excites contempt abroad and destroys confidence at home. Menaces are serious things and ought to be resorted to with as much caution and seriousness, as war itself; and should, if not successful, be invariably followed by it. . .

War in our country, ought never to be resorted to but when it is clearly justifiable and necessary; so much so as not to require the aid of logic to convince our understandings; nor the ardor of eloquence to inflame our passions. There are many reasons why this country should never resort to war but for causes the most urgent and necessary. . .

Sir, I might prove the war, should it ensue, justifiable, by the express admission of the gentleman from Virginia; . . . Why should I mention the impressment of our seamen; depredations on every branch of our commerce, including the direct export trade, continued for years, and made under laws which professedly undertake to regulate our trade with other nations; negotiations resorted to, again and again, till it is become hopeless; the restrictive system persisted in to avoid war, and in the vain expectation of returning justice? The evil still grows, and, in each succeeding year, swells in extent and pretention beyond the pre-

ceding. . . The question, even in the opinion and admission of our opponents is reduced to this single point —Which shall we do, abandon or defend our own commercial and maritime rights, and the personal liberties of our citizens employed in exercising them? These rights are vitally attacked and war is the only means of redress. . . .

The first argument . . . which I shall notice, is the unprepared state of the country. . . . If our country is unprepared, let us remedy the evil as soon as possible. . . . Let the gentleman submit his plan; . . . Let him not say, "I have acted in a minority." It is no less the duty of the minority than a majority to endeavor to defend the country. For that purpose we are sent here, and not for that of opposition.

We are next told of the expenses of the war; and that the people will not pay taxes. Why not? Is it from want of means? . . .

No, it has the ability; that is admitted; and will it not have the disposition? Is not the cause a just and necessary one? Shall we then utter this libel on the people? Where will proof be found of a fact so disgraceful? . . . But it may be, and I believe was said, that the people will not pay taxes, because the rights violated will not be worth defending; or that the defence will cost more than the gain. Sir, I here enter my solemn protest against this low and "calculating avarice" entering this hall of legislation. It is only fit for shops and counting houses, and ought not to disgrace the seat of power by its squalid aspect.

. .

We are next told of the dangers of war. I believe we are all ready to acknowledge its hazards and misfortunes. . . .

But we have not yet come to the end of the chapters of dangers. The gentleman's imagination, so fruitful on this subject, conceives that our constitution is not calculated for war, and that it cannot stand its rude shock. . . . If true, we must then depend upon the commiseration or contempt of other nations for our existence. The constitution, then, it seems, has failed in an essential object, "to provide for the common defence. . .

The love of France and the hatred of England have also been assigned as the cause of the present measures. France has not done us justice, says the gentleman from Virginia, and how can we, without partiality, resist the aggressions of England? . . . But I protest against the principle from which this conclusion is drawn. . . . Sir, when two invade your rights, you may resist both or either at your pleasure. It is regulated by prudence and not by right. The stale imputation of partiality for France is better calculated for the columns of a newspaper, than for the walls of this House.—*Calhoun, Works, Vol. II, pp. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11.*

January 14, 1813, he used these words in a debate over the New Army Bill:

. . . Whether, indeed, the principles of '98 are such as the gentleman has represented them to be, I will not inquire, because not necessary to my argument. But if they are, in truth, those of the gentleman and his present associates, I should be happy to know with what countenance they can request the people of this country to put the government into their hands. Trust the government to those who are hostile to it! If our opponents are, in reality, in favor of such principles, patriotism ought to persuade them to add one other, and that is, ever to remain a minority.

. . .

. . . But, say our opponents, as they were opposed to war, they are not bound to support it. . . . War has been declared by a law of the land; and what would be thought of similar attempts to defeat any other law, however inconsiderable its object? Who would dare to avow an intention to defeat its operation? Can, that then, be true in relation to war which would be reprobated in every other case? Can that course be right, which, when the whole physical force of the country is needed, withdraws half of that force? . . .

We are further told, that impressment of seamen was not considered a sufficient cause for war; and are asked, why should it be continued on that account? Individually (said Mr. Calhoun) I do not feel the force of the argument. . . .

But it is said that we ought to offer to England suitable regulations on this subject. . . . Sir, I deny that we are bound to tender any regulations. England is the party injuring. . . . But we have made our offer; it is, that the ship should protect the sailor. It is the most simple and only safe rule.—*Ibid., pp. 44, 45, 49, 50, 51.*

In the House of Representatives, on the Bill to increase the Direct Tax:

Mr. Calhoun said, he did not rise to consider whether the war was originally just and necessary, or whether the administration had abandoned the original objects of the contest . . . You have, for an enemy, a Power the most implacable and formidable . . . To meet this state of things, the whole of our resources will have to be called into action; and, what is of equal importance, with such promptitude as to be ready to act as soon as the season will admit. . . .

The enemy at present, presses the war both on our seaboard and interior frontier. The nature of the contest on either will, if properly considered, indicate the mode in which it ought to be met. On the seaboard it must be strictly defensive.

On the Canada frontier the war must assume an opposite character. If we wish to act with effect, it must there be wholly offensive. . . .

Her bosom is repossessed with the ambition and projects that inspired her in the year seventy-six. It is the war of the Revolution revived; we are again struggling for our liberty and independance. . . . *Ibid., pp. 110, 111, 112, 113, 116.*

Extracts from his speech of February 26, 1816, in the debate concerning the establishment of a National Bank:

He did not propose to comprehend, in this discussion, the power of Congress to grant bank charters: nor the question whether the general tendency of banks was favorable or unfavorable to the liberty and prosperity of the country. . . To discuss this question, he conceived, would be a useless consumption of time. The constitutional question had been already so freely dis-

cussed, that all had made up their minds on it. The question whether banks were favorable to public liberty and prosperity, was one purely speculative. . . .

Having established, as he conceived, in the course of his remarks, that the excess of paper issue was the true and only cause of depreciation of our paper currency, Mr. C. turned his attention to the manner in which that excess had been produced. It was intimately connected with the suspension of specie payments. They stood as cause and effect. First, the excessive issues caused the suspension of specie payments; an advantage had been taken of that suspension to issue still greater floods of it. . .

A national bank, he said, paying specie itself, would have a tendency to make specie payments general, as well by its influence as by its example. . . .

The restoration of specie payments, Mr. C. argued, would remove the embarrassments under which the industry of the country labored, and the stains from its public and private faith. It remained to see whether this House, without whose aid it was vain to expect success in this object, would have the fortitude to apply this remedy.—*Ibid., pp. 154, 159, 160, 161.*

His views in 1816, in regard to the tariff, are set forth in these extracts from his speech of April 16 of that year:

The debate heretofore on this subject has been on the degree of protection which ought to be afforded to our cotton and woollen manufacturers: all professing to be friendly to those infant establishments, and to be willing to extend to them adequate encouragement. . . .

Neither agriculture, manufactures, nor commerce, taken separately, is the cause of wealth; it flows from the three combined, and cannot exist without each. . . . When our manufactures are grown to a certain perfection, as they soon will under the fostering care of Government, we will no longer experience these evils. The farmer will find a ready market for his surplus produce; and, what is almost of equal consequence, a certain and cheap supply of all his wants. His prosperity will diffuse itself to every class in the

community; and, instead of that languor of industry and individual distress now incident to a state of war and suspended commerce, the wealth and vigor of the community will not be materially impaired. . . . To give perfection to this state of things, it will be necessary to add, as soon as possible a system of internal improvements, and at least such an extension of our navy as will prevent the cutting off of our coasting trade. . . .

On the contrary he firmly believed that the country is prepared, even to maturity, for the introduction of manufactures. We have abundance of resources, and things naturally tend at this moment in that direction. . . .

Other objections of a political character were made to the encouragement of manufactures. It is said they destroy the moral and physical power of the people. This might formerly have been true to a considerable extent, before the perfection of machinery, and when the success of the manufactures depended on the minute subdivisions of labor. At that time it required a large proportion of the population of a country to be engaged in them; and every minute subdivision of labor is undoubtedly unfavorable to the intellect; but the great perfection of machinery has in a considerable degree obviated these objections. . . . It has been further asserted that manufactures are the fruitful cause of pauperism; and England has been referred to as furnishing conclusive evidence of its truth. For his part, he could conceive no such tendency in them, but the exact contrary, as they furnished new stimulus and means of subsistence to the laboring classes of the community. . . .

Again, it is calculated to bind together more closely our widely-spread republic. . . . He regarded the fact that it would make the parts adhere more closely; that it would form a new and most powerful cement, as out-weighing any political objection that might be urged against the system. In this opinion the liberty and the union of this country were inseparably united. That, as the destruction of the latter would most certainly involve the former, so its maintainance, will with equal certainty preserve it. . . . This single

work comprehended almost the sum of our political dangers; and against it we ought to be perpetually guarded.—*Ibid., pp. 163, 166, 167, 169, 171, 172, 173*

March 9, 1836, he made his first great speech on the "Abolition petitions." In part, he said:

The decision, then, of the question now before the Senate is reduced to the single point—Are we bound to receive these petitions? Or, to vary the form of the question—Would it be a violation of the right of petition not to receive them? . .

There must be some point all will agree, where the right of petition ends, and that of this body begins. . . . To extend the right of petition beyond representation, is clearly to extend it beyond that point where the action of the Senate commences and, as such, is a manifest violation of its constitutional rights. Here then we have the limits between the right of petition and the right of the Senate to regulate its proceedings clearly fixed, and so perfectly defined as not to admit of mistake—and I would add of controversy, had it not been questioned in this discussion.

. . . At the head of these it has been urged, again and again, that petitions have a right to be heard, and, that not to receive petitions is to refuse a hearing.

. . .

What then is meant by the assertion that these petitioners have a right to be heard? Is it meant that they have a right to appear in the Senate chamber in person to present their petition, and to be heard in its defence? . .

But one more sense can be attached to the assertion. It may be meant that the petitioners have a right to have their petitions discussed by the Senate. . . .

My object at present is to establish beyond the possibility of doubt that we are not bound to receive these petitions; and when that is accomplished, I will then show the disastrous consequences which must follow the reception of the petition, be the after disposition what it may. . . .

I have now, I trust, established beyond all controversy, that we are not bound to receive these petitions;

and that if we should reject them we would not, in the slightest degree, infringe the right of petition. . . .

Give the right of petition the extent contended for; decide that we are bound under the constitution, to receive these incendiary petitions, and the very motion before the Senate would be out of order. If the constution makes it our duty to receive, we would have no discretion left to reject, as the motion presupposes. . . .

Of all the rights belonging to a deliberative body, I know of none more universal, or indispensable to a proper performance of its functions, than the right to determine at its discretion what it shall receive, over what it shall extend its jurisdiction, and to what it shall direct its deliberation and action. . . . To what would we commit ourselves? If a petition should be presented, praying the abolition of the constitution (which we are all bound by our oaths to protect), according to this abominable doctrine, it must be received. So if it prayed the abolition of the Decalogue, or of the Bible itself. . .

No one can believe that the fanatics, who have flooded this and the other House with their petitions, entertain the slightest hope that Congress would pass a law, at this time, to abolish slavery in this District. . . .

Such would be the advantages yielded to the abolitionists. In proportion to their gain would be our loss. What would be yielded to them would be taken from us. Our true position, that which is indispensable to our defence here, is, that Congress has no legitimate jurisdiction over the subject of slavery either here or elsewhere. . .

The Senators from the slaveholding States, who, most unfortunately, have committed themselves to vote for receiving these incendiary petitions, tell us that whenever the attempt shall be made to abolish slavery they will join with us to repel it. I doubt not the sincerity of their declaration. We all have a common interest and they can not betray ours, without betraying, at the same time, their own. But I announce to them that they are now called on to redeem their pledge. The attempt is now being made. The work is going on daily and hourly. The war is waged, not only in

the most dangerous manner, but in the only manner that it can be waged. Do they expect that the abolitionists will resort to arms, and commence a crusade to liberate our slaves by force? Is this what they mean when they speak of the attempt to abolish slavery? If so, let me tell our friends of the South who differ from us, that the war which the abolitionists wage against us is of a very different character, and far more effective. [It is a war of religious and political fanaticism, mingled, on the part of the leaders, with ambition and the love of notoriety and waged not against our lives, but against our character. The object is to humble and debase us in our own estimation, and that of the world in general; to blast our reputation while they overthrow our domestic institutions. This is the mode in which they are attempting abolition, with such ample means and untiring industry; and now is the time for all who are opposed to them to meet the attack. How can it be successfully met? This is the important question. There is but one way: we must meet the eneny on the frontier on the question of receiving; we must secure that important pass—it is our Thermopylæ. (The power of resistance, by an universal law of nature, is on the exterior.) Break through the shell—penetrate the crust, and there is no resistance within. In the present contest, the question on receiving constitutes our frontier. *Ibid., pp. 466, 467, 469, 470, 471, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484.*

His relations to General Jackson, in 1837, come out pretty well in the quotation from Jackson's letter, and the reply of Calhoun in the Senate:

"You cannot but be aware, sir, that the imputations which your language convéys are calculated, if believed, to destroy my character as a man, and that the charge is one which, if true, ought to produce my impeachment and punishment as a public officer. If I caused the removal of the deposits for the base purpose of enriching myself or my friends by the results which might grow out of that measure, there is no term of reproach which I do not deserve, and no punishment known to the laws which ought not to be in-

flicted upon me. On the contrary, if the whole imputation, both as to motive and fact, be a fabrication and a calumny, the punishment which belongs to me, if guilty, is too mild for him who willfully makes it.

On this Calhoun makes the following comments:

I do not intend, said Mr. C., in what I propose to say, to comment on the character or the language of this extraordinary letter. It has excited in my bosom but one feeling, that of pity for the weakness of its author, contempt for his menace, and humiliation that one occupying the office which he does, should place himself in a situation so unworthy of his exalted station.

My object is to avail myself of the occasion to reiterate what I said, as broadly and fully as I uttered them on a former occasion. . . .

I then asked what had caused this inundation of paper? The answer was, the "experiment" (I love to remind the gentleman of the word) which had removed the only restrictions that existed against the issue of bank paper. The consequences were predicted at the time; it was foretold that banks would multiply almost without number, and pour forth their issues without restriction or limitation.

The experiment commenced by a transfer of the public funds from where they were placed by law, and where they were under safe guard and protection, to banks which were under the sole and unlimited control of the Executive.

I then remarked that, if rumor were to be trusted, it was not only in a political point of view that those in power had profited by the vast means put in the hands of the Executive by the experiment—they had profited in a pecuniary, as well as in a political point of view.

Having established these points, I next undertook to show that this bill would consummate these speculations, and establish the political ascendancy which the experiment had given to the Administration. . . .

Having established this point, I then undertook to show, that it would increase vastly the power of the government in the new States, if they chose to exercise this patronage for political purposes.

Assuming, then that the power would be exercised with a view to political influence, I showed that it would place a vast number of the citizens of the new States, probably not less than one hundred thousand, in a condition of complete dependence on the receivers, and vassalage to the Government. —*Calhoun, Works, Vol. III, pp. 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.*

.

February 14, 1837, Calhoun sets forth his views in regard to the relation of international law to slavery in these remarks in the Senate:

The three brigs were engaged in the coasting trade; . . . The Enterprise was forced, by stress of weather, into Port Hamilton, Bermuda; where the slaves on board were forcibly seized and detained by the local authorities. . . .

These are the essential facts of the case. He did not intend to argue the question that grew out of them. There was, indeed, little or no ground for argument. No one, in the least conversant with the laws of nations, can doubt that those vessels, were as much under the protection of our flag, while on their voyage, proceeding from one part of the Union to another, as if they were in port, lying at the wharves, within our acknowledged jurisdiction. Nor is it less clear that, forced as the Enterprise was, by stress of weather, and taken, under the circumstances, as the passengers and crews of the other two were, into the British dominions, they lost none of the rights which belong to them while on their voyage on the ocean. So far otherwise—so far from losing the protection which our flag gave them while on the ocean, they had superadded, by their misfortunes, the additional rights which the laws of humanity extend to the unfortunate in their situation, and which are regarded by all civilized nations as sacred. It follows as a necessary consequence, that the municipal laws of the place could not divest the owners of the property which, as citizens of the United States, they held in the slaves who were passengers in the vessels;—and yet, as clear as is this conclusion, they were forcibly seized and detained by the local authorities of the island; and the government of Great

Britain, after five years' negotiation, has not only withheld redress, but has not even deigned to answer the oft repeated application of our government in regard to it. We are thus left, by its silence, to conjecture the reason for so extraordinary a course.

On casting his eyes over the whole subject he could fix but on one that had the least plausibility—and that resting on a principle which it was scarcely credible that a government so intelligent could assume: (he meant the principle that there could not be property in persons,) . . .

The principle which would abrogate the property of our citizens in their slaves, would equally abrogate the dominion of Great Britain over the subject nations under her control. (If an individual can have no property in another, how can one nation, which is but an aggregate of individuals, have dominion, which involves the highest right of property, over another? If man has, by nature, the right of self-government, have not nations, on the same principle, an equal right?—*Ibid., pp. 10, 11, 12.*

Whether he had changed his views in regard to the constitutionality of a bank may perhaps be inferred from these extracts from a speech of 1837:

He was not prepared to say what the opinion of the people of the United States is, at this time, in relation to a Bank; and much less was he prepared to commit himself in favor of one in the contingency contemplated by the amendment. Where the Constitution or important principles are involved, his only guide was his judgment and his conscience, and not the popular voice.

. . . .

He was master of his own move; and acknowledged connection with no party but the States Right party, —the small band of nullifiers—and acted either with or against the administration or the National party just as it was calculated to further the principles and policy which we, of that party, regard as essential to the liberty and institutions of the country. . . .

The object for which he, and those with whom he had

acted had united with the Nationals, had been accomplished—Executive usurpation had been arrested. . . . We are sworn enemies both of Executive and Legislative usurpation; and of the two, more opposed, if possible, to the latter than the former, because, in the nature of things, they must take precedence in the order of time. Without Legislative there could be no Executive usurpation.—*Ibid., pp. 97, 98, 99.*

The resolutions that Calhoun introduced into the Senate in 1837 led to one of the very famous debates in our history. The following extracts from the resolutions and Calhoun's speech in their support will let us see Calhoun better than almost any speech of his senatorial career:

Resolved, That in the adoption of the Federal Constitution, the States adopting the same, acted severally, as free, independent and sovereign States; and that each, for itself, by its own voluntary act, entered into the Union with a view to its increased security against all dangers, domestic, as well as foreign, and the more perfect and secure enjoyment of its advantages, natural political, and social.

Resolved: That, in delegating a portion of their powers to be exercised by the Federal Government, the states retained, severally, the exclusive and sole right over their own domestic institutions and police,—and are alone responsible for them; . . .

Resolved,—That this Government was instituted and adopted by the several States of this Union as a common agent, in order to carry into effect the powers which they had delegated by the constitution for their mutual security and prosperity; . . .

Resolved, That the intermeddling of any State or States, or their citizens, to abolish slavery in this District, or in any of the territories, on the ground, or under the pretext, that it is immoral or sinful—or the passage of any act or measure of Congress with that view, would be a direct and dangerous attack on the institutions of all the slave holding States. . . .

After reading his resolutions, he said:

He did not desire that these resolutions should pass

by a bare majority; he wished them to pass by a unanimous vote. . . .

He looked to these resolutions to awake an active spirit in favor of the constitution. The idea that this Republic is made up of one great aggregate of individuals, tended to increase the zeal of these fanatics, and the more rapid spread of their doctrines. . .

On the one side, there was a portion of the people of the North, who assert and maintain that our domestic institutions are sinful and immoral. On the other, we claim these institutions as secured to us under the Constitution, which we will not suffer them to interfere with; and here is the point at issue. . . .

Mr. C. professed himself a firm and unflinching friend of the Union. He was averse to making professions—but he had, on this subject, been shamefully and grossly misrepresented, here and elsewhere. . .

This spirit of abolition was nothing more or less than that fanaticism, which had carried thousands of victims to the stake. What aroused that demoniacal spirit in past time, but the opinion that the faith of one man was criminal in the eyes of another? Here, the same spirit was attempted to be revived, under the name of abolition; and he trusted the good sense of the country would put it down. . . .

He now saw with equal clearness, as clear as the noon-day sun, the fatal consequences which would follow if the present disease be not timely arrested. He would repeat again, what he had so often said on this floor. This was the only question of sufficient magnitude and potency to divide this Union; and divide it, it would, or drench the country in blood, if not arrested. . . .

The assaults daily made on the institutions of nearly one-half of the States of this Union by the other—institutions interwoven from the beginning with their political and social existence, and which cannot be other than they are, without their inevitable destruction will, and must, if continued, make *two peoples of one*, by destroying every sympathy between the two great sections, obliterating from their hearts the recollections of their common danger and glory, and implanting in their place a mutual hatred, more deadly than ever

existed between two neighboring peoples since the commencement of the human race. He feared not the circulation of the thousand incendiary and slanderous publications, which were daily issued from an organized and powerful press, among those intended to be villified.

. . .

The Senator next inquired, what was meant by the States Rights party. He did not expect the inquiry from that quarter; but as it was made, he would reply to it. He meant the party who believed that this was a federal republic, a republic, the constituent parts of which were states; in contradistinction to a national consolidated republic, in which the constituent parts were the aggregate mass of the American people, taken collectively, and in which the states bore the same relation to the whole as counties do to the states. . . .

He ought not, perhaps, to be surprised that Senators should differ so widely from him on this subject. They did not view the disease as he did. He saw working at the bottom of these movements the same spirit which, two centuries ago, convulsed the Christian world and deluged it in blood; that fierce and cruel spirit of persecution which originated in assumed superiority and mistaken principles of duty that made one man believe that he was accountable for the sins of another, and that he was the judge of what belonged to his temporal and eternal welfare, and was bound, at the peril of his own soul, to interfere to rescue him from perdition. Against this fell and bloody spirit it was in vain to interpose this amendment.—*Ibid., pp. 140, 141, 143, 147, 148, 153, 154, 166, 177-178.*

In 1847, he makes another speech, which lays Calhoun and his ideas bare to our view:

Mr. President, it was solemnly asserted on this floor sometime ago, that all parties in the non-slave-holding states had come to a fixed and solemn determination upon two propositions. One was, that there should be no further admission of any States into this Union which permitted, by their constitutions, the existence of slavery; the other was, that slavery shall not hereafter exist in any of the territories of the United States; the effect of which would be to give to the

non-slaveholding states the monopoly of the public domain to the entire exclusion of the slave-holding States. . . .

Sir, there is no mistaking the signs of the times; and it is high time that the Southern States—the slaveholding States should inquire what is now their relative strength in this Union, and what it will be if this determination should be carried into effect. Already we are in the minority, . . except in the Senate of the United States. . . . There are 228 representatives, including Iowa, which is already represented there. Of these, 138 are from non-slave-holding States, and 90 are from what are called the slave States—giving a majority, in the aggregate, to the former of 48. In the electoral college there are 168 votes belonging to the non-slave-holding states and 118 to the slave holding, giving a majority of 50 to the non-slave holding.

. . .

And this equality in this body is one of the most transient character. Already Iowa is a state; When she appears here, there will be an addition of two senators to the representatives here of the non-slave holding States. Already Wisconsin has passed the initiatory stage, and will be here the next session. This will add two more, making a clear majority of four in this body on the side of the non-slave holding States, who will thus be enabled to sway every branch of this government at their will and pleasure.

. . .

Sir, there is ample space for twelve or fifteen of the largest description of States in the territories belonging to the United States. . . .

Sir, if this state of things is to go on—if this determination so solemnly made, is to be persisted in, where shall we stand as far as this federal government of ours is concerned? We shall be at the entire mercy of the non slaveholding States. . . .

Sir, the day that the balance between the two sections of the country—the slaveholding States and the non-slaveholding States—is destroyed, is a day that will not be far removed from political revolution, anarchy, civil war, and widespread disaster. . .

How, then, do we stand in reference to this territor-

ial question—this public domain of ours? Why, sir, what is it? It is the common property of the states of this Union They are called "the territories of the United States." And what are the "United States but the States united"? Sir, these territories are the property of the states united; held jointly for their common use. . . .

Sir, here let me say a word as to the compromise line. I have always considered it a great error—highly injurious to the South, . . . Yet I would have been willing to acquiesce in a continuation of the Missouri Compromise, in order to preserve, under the present trying circumstances, the peace of the country. . .

I see my way in the Constitution; I cannot in a compromise. A compromise is but an act of Congress. It may be overruled at any time. It gives us no security. But the constitution is stable. It is a rock. . . .

Let us be done with compromises. Let us go back and stand upon the Constitution. . . .

I am a planter—a cotton-planter. I am a Southern man and a slave holder—a kind and a merciful one—I trust—and none the worse for being a slave holder. I say, for one, I would rather meet any extremity upon earth than give up one inch of our equality—one inch of what belongs to us as members of this great republic! What! acknowledge inferiority! The surrender of life is nothing to sinking down into acknowledged inferiority! . . .

He ends his speech with these resolutions:

Resolved, that the territories of the United States belong to the several states composing this Union, and are held by them as their joint and common property.

. . .

"Resolved, That the enactment of any law, which should directly, or by its effects, deprive the citizens of any of the States of this Union from emigrating with their property, into any of the territories of the United States, will make such discriminations, and would, therefore, be a violation of the Constitution and the rights of the States from which such citizens emigrated, and in derrogation of that perfect equality which belongs to them as members of this Union—and

would tend directly to subvert the Union itself. . . . *Calhoun Works, IV., p. 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348.*

His views on the acquisition of territory stand out clearly in these extracts, made from a speech of January 4, 1848:

"Resolved, That, to conquer Mexico, and to hold it either as a province or to incorporate it in the Union would be inconsistent with the avowed object for which the war has been prosecuted; a departure from the settled policy of the government; in conflict with its character and genius; and, in the end, subversive of our free and popular institutions!

"Resolved, That no line of policy in the further prosecution of the war should be adopted which may lead to consequences so disastrous." . . .

He proceeds with the discussion, after reading the above resolutions:

The next reason assigned is, that either holding Mexico as a province, or incorporating her into the Union, would be unprecedented by any example in our history. We have conquered many of the neighboring tribes of Indians, but we have never thought of holding them in subjection, or of incorporating them into our Union. They have been left as an independent people in the midst of us, or been driven back into the forest. Nor have we ever incorporated into the Union any but the Caucasian race. To incorporate Mexico would be the first departure of the kind; for more than half of its population are pure Indians, and by far the larger portion of the residue mixed blood. I protest against the incorporation of such a people. Ours is the government of the white man. . . .

The next remaining reasons assigned, that it would be in conflict with the genius and character of our government, and, in the end, subversive of our free institutions, are intimately connected, and I shall consider them together.

That it would be contrary to the genius and character of our government, and subversive of our free popular institutions, to hold Mexico as a subject province,

is a proposition too clear for argument before a body so enlightened as the Senate. You know the American Constitution too well, you have looked into history, and are too well acquainted with the fatal effects which large provincial possessions have ever had on institutions of free States,—to need any proof to satisfy you how hostile it would be to the institutions of this country to hold Mexico as a subject province. There is not an example on record of any free State holding a province of the same extent and population without disastrous consequences. The nations conquered and held as a province, have, in time, retalliated by destroying the liberty of their conquerors, through the corrupting effects of extended patronage and irresponsible power. Such, certainly, would be our case. The conquest of Mexico would add so vastly to the patronage of this government, that it would absorb the whole powers of the State; the Union would become an imperial power and the states reduced to mere subordinate corporations. But the evil would not end there; the process would go on, and the power transferred from the States to the Union would be transferred from the legislative department to the executive. All the immense patronage. which holding it as a province would create, the maintenance of a large army to hold it in subjection, and the appointment of a multitude of civil officers necessary to govern it, would be vested in him. The great influence which it would give the president, would be the means of controling the legislative department, and subjecting it to his dictation, especially when combined with the principle of proscription which has now become the established practice of the government. The struggle to obtain the presidential chair would become proportionally great—so great as to destroy the freedom of elections. The end would be anarchy or despotism, as certain as I am now addressing the Senate.

. . .

Nor are the reasons less weighty against incorporating her into the Union. As far as law is concerned, this is easily done. All that is necessary is to establish a territorial government for the several states in Mexico,—of which there are upwards of twenty,—to appoint governors, judges, and magistrates,—and to give to the population a subordinate right of making

laws, we defraying the cost of the government. So far as legislation goes, the work will be done; but there would be a great difference between the territorial government, and those which we have heretofore established within our own limits. These are only the offsets of our own people, or foreigners from the same countries from which our ancestors came. . . . During the period of their territorial government, no force is necessary to keep them in a state of subjection. The case will be entirely different from these Mexican territories; when you form them, you must have powerful armies to hold them in subjection, with all the expenses incident in supporting them. You may call them territories, but they would, in reality, be but provinces under another name, and would involve the country in all the difficulties and dangers which I have already shown would result from holding the country in that condition. How long this state of things would last, before they would be fitted to be incorporated into the Union as States, we may form some idea, from similar instances, with which we are familiar.—*Ibid., pp. 396, 410, 411, 412, 414, 415.*

QUESTIONS.

(1) What did Calhoun think of war? (2) Did he believe in "bluff"? (3) What effects did it produce? (4) What causes did he believe we had for war against England? (5) Compare the causes he gives with those given in previous studies by Clay, by Webster. (6) Compare the style of setting forth these causes by the three men. (7) Which was the most effective? (8) What objections had been made to the war. (9) Find out who had made these objections. (10) What did he think about the responsibility of minorities? (11) Do you agree? (12) How did he believe the war should be carried on? (13) Make an outline covering his speeches on the war.

(1) What would you say Calhoun was, judged by his tariff speech, and his speech on the bank, a nationalist or a states rights' man? (2) Give all your proofs for your opinion. (3) How did Calhoun look at industrial life if it was to be the most beneficial? (4) What did he believe caused the depreciation of the paper money? (5) What kind of money did he advocate? (6) Were the views expressed in his speeches of 1816 in harmony with his later speeches?

(1) What view did he take on the right of petition? (2) Compare his arguments with those of J. Q. Adams. (3) Summarize his arguments. (4) How did he regard the abolitionists? (5) How did he hold that they violated the Constitution? (6) Could slavery and the right of petition both exist at the same time? (7) What rights had Congress over the subject of slavery accord-

ing to Calhoun? (8) Compare his position with Clay's on this question; with Websters. (9) What was the South's Thermopylae?

(1) What was the relation between Calhoun and Jackson in 1837? (2) Find out the reason for this feeling. (3) What charges had Calhoun made against Jackson's order for the "removal of the deposits"? (4) Find out about the "removal of the deposits." (5) Did Calhoun recede from his position? (6) Compare his feeling for Jackson with the feelings of Clay and Webster towards him. (7) Explain so much ill-will among our great men.

(1) What international rights did Calhoun claim for slavery? (2) If his position was true what was the legal difference between a slave and a bale of cotton? (3) Try to find out whether he was technically right or not. (4) What view did Webster take of the question? (5) Outline his arguments on the question.

(1) To what party did he belong in 1837? (2) What danger did he think he saw that he was opposing?

(1) What did he affirm was the nature of the Constitution? (2) Who was to be the final judge in cases of infraction of the Constitution? (3) Compare his views with Websters. (4) What did he hold in regard to the right of one state to interfere or intermeddle in the affairs of another? (5) What did he consider intermeddling? (6) Did he still love the Union? (7) Was there anything of more importance? (8) To what did he compare Abolitionism? (9) Hunt out his predictions. (10) Were they fulfilled? (11) How did he define the States Rights' view. (12) How did he feel in regard to the non-extension of slavery into the territories? (13) Trace the effect on the Union of an unequal number of states—free and slave. (14) Give his argument in regard to rights in the territory. (15) If you had lived in the South at the time how would you probably have felt? (16) What did he believe in regard to compromise?

(1) What did he think about the results of the acquisition of territory? (2) Compare his views with Clay's, with Webster's on this subject. (3) What reasons does he assign? (4) Are they applicable to-day? (5) Summarize his arguments. (6) What answer can you give to his arguments? (7) Make a diagram to show the arguments of Clay, Webster, and Calhoun in regard to the subject of expansion.

(1) Write a paper or a series of papers comparing these three great men. (2) Which do you like best and why?

CHARLES SUMNER

A native of Massachusetts, 1811. Graduate of Harvard. A lawyer. Visited Europe, 1836-1837. Senator, 1851-1872. Great oration on "Peace," 1845. Speech on "The Crime against Kansas," 1856. Attacked by Brooks in Senate, 1856. An invalid as result, 1856-1860. Opposed San Domingo treaty, 1870. Supported Greeley for President, 1872. Died, 1872.

CHAPTER VI

CHARLES SUMNER

IN leaving Clay, Calhoun, and Webster, and in taking up the life of Sumner we find ourselves in a new environment, in a new atmosphere. Clay and Webster had stood for the Union above all things else. They were ready to compromise when questions appeared that seemed to endanger their beloved Union. I believe it may also be said that the "Great Nullifier" was *such* for the very reason that he, too, loved the Union. Some interpretation of the constitution must be found that would make it possible for both slavery and the Union to exist. He hoped he had found it in this doctrine. If this be a true interpretation of our history, then Clay in his Compromises, Webster in his Union speech of March 7th, and Calhoun in his Nullification plans were all aiming at the same goal—the preservation of the Union.

Now when we turn to the younger group of statesmen of whom Sumner is one of the best representatives from the North, we find them more anxious about slavery than about the Union. It may be that they loved the Union no less, but at least they were concerned about slavery more. Sumner was not, or professed not to be, an abolitionist. Yet slavery was the theme of nearly all his strongest thinking. It would seem that his pen could hardly complete

a letter, or indite an address without discussing that question in some way.

The few pages at command for this study make it impossible to illustrate the later years of his life. His voice and pen were busy till the end, and the published volumes of his speeches number fourteen, while his letters, if all were gathered together, would make many volumes more. Thus it will be seen that many features of his life can not be touched. Enough can only be hoped to be done to arouse the desire to know more. In such a series of studies as this the southern statesman also should appear; such men as Toombs, A. H. Stephens, and Davis should speak for their cause. We are now far enough away from the scenes of 1861 to be able to admit that honesty of convictions was found on both sides of Mason and Dixon's line. No true picture of our country's history can be had till we consider both sides, and hear representative men of both sides speak. At last it may be said that the American people are ready to listen, hence it may be hoped that this study will be discussed no more fairly in the North than in the South. As a great, if an aggressive American, he has a place in our life, and we must seek it, and analzye the problem. The latter can never be solved, if such men as he be omitted from our studies. Hoping, then, for as appreciative a reception for this study, as for the earlier ones, we will let Sumner tell us something of his life.

Sumner's father wrote the following letter to Mr. Partridge in 1826, when thinking of send-

ing Charles to Partridge's Military Academy for a time:

. . . I have a son, named Charles Sumner, in his fifteenth year, and large of his age, but not of so firm and solid a constitution as I should wish to have him. He has no immoral practices or propensities known to me; he has acquired a pretty good knowledge of Latin and Greek, understands the fundamental rules of arithmetic, and has a superficial knowledge of the whole. He is well acquainted with geography and history, both ancient and modern; in fine, he has been four years at the public Latin School in Boston, sustaining a good standing in the class, which will be qualified for admission at Cambridge College in 182 , for which I do not design him. The life of a scholar would be too sedentary and inactive for him. . . . *Pierce, Life and Letters of Sumner, Vol. I, pp. 42, 43.*

The following letter from Sumner, 1829, while a student in Harvard College, lets us see something of him and of college life of the time:

. . . Have told you everything new in college now. Everything here is always the same—the same invariable round of bells and recitations, of diggings and of deads! Mathematics piled on mathematics! Metaphysics murdered and mangled! Prayer-bells after prayer-bells! but, worse than all commons upon commons! Clean, handsome plates, and poor food! By the way, the commons bell rung fifteen minutes ago. If I don't stop, I shall lose the invaluable meal. Accordingly, adieu.

Charles Sumner.

N. B.—Spare me! Oh, spare me! *Eheu me miserum!* . . . I arrived too late; lost my breakfast; got to University, however, soon enough to be present at one of Follen's lectures. 'This was the unkindest cut of all.' Again, adieu.

C. S."

Ibid., pp. 51, 52.

To classmates, he wrote:

. . . You would have sooner thought, I suppose, that fire and water would have embraced than mathematics and myself; but, strange to tell, we are close

friends now. I really get geometry with some pleasure. I usually devote four hours in the forenoon to it. I have determined not to study any profession this year, and I have marked out for myself a course which will fully occupy my time,—namely, a course of mathematics, Juvenal, Tacitus, a course of modern history, Hallam's "Middle Ages" and "Constitutional History," and Roscoe's "Leo" and "Lorenzo," and Robertson's "Charles V.;" with indefinite quantities of Shakespeare, Burton, British poets, etc., and writing an indefinite number of long letters. . . . *Ibid., p. 81.*

I think of hitching upon the law at Cambridge this coming commencement. I am greatful for the encouraging word you give me. I am rather despondent and I meet from none of my family those vivifying expressions which a young mind always accepts. My father says nought by way of encouragement. He seems determined to let me shape my own course, so that if I am wise, I shall be wise for myself, and if I am foolish, I alone shall bear it. It may be well that this is so. . . .—*Memoirs I, p. 87.*

His friend, W. W. Story, writes concerning Sumner in these words:

He was then, as ever in after life, an indefatigable and omnivorous student. He lived simply, was guilty of no excesses of any kind, went very little into society, and devoted his days and nights to books. Of all men I knew at his age, he was the least susceptible to the charms of women. Men he liked best and with them he preferred to talk. It was in vain that the lovliest and livliest tried to absorb his attention. . . This was a constant source of amusement to us, and we used to lay wagers with the pretty girls, that with all their arts they could not keep him at their side a quarter of an hour. . . Though he was an interesting talker he had no lightness of hand. . . He had no humor himself, and little sense of it in others; and his jests when he tried to make one, were rather cumbrous. . . *Ibid., p. 107.*

To his friend Charlemagne Tower, he wrote, 1832:

. . Tower, we have struck the true profession; the one in which the mind is the most sharpened and quickened, and the duties of which properly discharged, are the most vital to the interests of the country,—for religion exists independent of its ministers; every breast feels it: but the law lives only in the honesty and earning of lawyers. . . —*Ibid., p. 111.*

Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote of Sumner in these words:

. . . He had already a name for scholarship, especially for legal knowledge. He was an amiable, simple-hearted, blameless young man; pleasant, affable, cheerful, with little imagination, wit, or sense of humor. I remember Park Benjamin said of him, in his rather extravagant way, that, if one told Charles Sumner that the moon was made of green cheese, he would controvert the alleged fact in all sincerity, and give good reason why it could not be so. . . .—*Memoirs I, p. 164.*

. . . That is a glorious document [Jackson's Proclamation] worthy of any President. Our part of the country rejoices in it as a true exposition of the Constitution, and a fervid address to those wayward men who are now plunging us into disgrace abroad and misery at home. . . . *Memoirs I, p. 117.*

In a letter to his parents, written from Washington in 1834, he spoke of his first view of slavery as follows:

. . . For the first time I saw slaves, and my worst preconception of their appearance and ignorance did not fall as low as their actual stupidity. They appear to be nothing more than moving masses of flesh, unendowed with anything above the intelligence of the brutes. I have now an idea of the blight upon that part of our country in which they live. . . .

. . . Calhoun has given notice today that he will speak tomorrow on Mr. Webster's bank-bill. I shall probably hear him, and he will be the last man I shall ever hear speak in Washington. I probably shall never come here again. I have little or no desire ever to come again in any capacity. Nothing that I have seen of

politics has made me look upon them with any feeling other than loathing. . . . *Ibid., pp. 134, 142.*

To Francis Lieber, January 9, 1836:

. . . You are in the midst of slavery, seated among its whirling eddies blown around as they are by the blasts of Governor McDuffie, fiercer than any from the old wind-bags of Æolus. What think you of it? Should it longer exist? Is not emancipation practicable? We are becoming Abolitionists at the North fast; the riots, the attempts to abridge the freedom of discussion, Governor McDuffie's message, and the conduct of the South generally have caused many to think favorably of immediate emancipation who never before inclined to it. . . . *Memoirs I, p. 173.*

He wrote on December 7, 1837, to W. F. Frick, the following words concerning the study of law. In part, he said:

. . . Pursue the law, then, as a science; study it in books; and let the results of your studies ripen from meditation and conversation in your own mind. Make it a rule never to pass a sentence or phrase or proposition which you do not understand. . . . There are few, I flatter myself, who are more disposed than I am to view the law as a coherent collection of principles rather than a bundle of cases. With me, cases are the exponents of principles; and I would have you read them in order to understand the principles of the law and the grounds of them. The best way, therefore, of reading them is in connection with some text-book, following the different references in the margin to their sources, and thus informing yourself of the reasons by which the principles are supported. . . .

The most important cases, in which some principle has first been evolved or first received a novel application, are called "leading cases," and all these should be read with great attention. . . .

. . . I need hardly add to these desultory recommendations that you cannot read history too much, particularly that of England and the United States. History is the record of human conduct and experience, and it is to this that jurisprudence is applied. Moreover, in the English history is to be found the grad-

ual development of that portion of the common law which is called the Constitution—for the British Constitution stands chiefly on the common law. The history of legislation in England contains the origin, also, of portions of the Constitution. History is of itself such a fascinating study that it can need to your mind no such feeble recommendation as mine. . . *Memoirs I, pp. 207, 208.*

December 25, 1837, he ended his journal of that day, which he kept during his first visit to Europe, in these words:

. . . May I return with an undiminished love for my friends and country, with a heart and mind untainted by the immoralities of the Old World, manners untouched by its affectations, and a willingness to resume my labors with an unabated determination to devote myself faithfully to the duties of an American? . . . *Ibid, p. 214.*

From Boston, a few months after his return to America, he wrote to a London friend as follows:

Our politics are shabby enough. The Whigs, constituting the opposition, have nominated for the Presidency, the person whose head adorns a corner of this sheet. He has in his favor his good conduct during the war of 1812, and an alleged victory at Tippecanoe; and the vulgar appeal is made, grounded on military success. This has made him a more acceptable candidate than Clay or Webster, who have been serving the State well for years. . . .

An Administration paper alluded to him as living in a log-cabin and drinking hard-cider. The Whigs at once adopted these words and placed them on their favors. They proclaimed Harrison the candidate of the "log-cabin and hard cider" class. And this vulgar appeal is made by the party professing the monopoly of intelligence and education in the country! But it has had its effect. The country seems revolutionized, and the Whigs are confident. . . .—*Pierce, Memoirs, Vol. II, pp. 165, 166.*

A few months later he wrote:

I fear the coming six months will be a perfect Saturnalia in our poor country; the Whigs, elated with success, hungry by abstinence from office for twelve years, and goaded by the recollection of ancient wrongs, will push their victory to the utmost. Of course, the example set by Jackson will be followed; and perhaps improved upon; there will be a general turnout of all present office-holders at home and abroad; the war of parties will have new venom. . . . There is so much passion, and so little principle so much devotion to *party*, and so little to country in both parties; that I think we have occasion for deep anxiety. . . . The Whigs have met with their present surprising and most unexpected success by means of their low appeals to hard-cider, log-cabins and the like. . . . *Ibid.*, *p. 168.*

In this extract from a letter to Jacob Harvey, we see something of the ideas that now begin to ferment in Sumners' brain, 1842:

I agree with you entirely with regard to the "Creole" affair, except, perhaps, that I go further than you do.

In the first place, England cannot deliver up the slaves who are not implicated in the mutiny and murder by which the government of the ship was overthrown. She laid down a rule not to recognize property in human beings since the date of her great Emancipation Act. The principle of this is very clear. She will not in any way lend her machinery of justice to execute foreign laws which she has pronounced immoral, unchristian and unjust. She had not so pronounced until her act of Emancipation. . . .

Slavery is not a national institution; nor is it one recognized by the law of nations. It is peculiar to certain states. It draws its vitality from the legislation of those States. Now, this legislation is of course limited to those states. . . . *Ibid., pp. 199, 200.*

To his brother George he wrote, April 1, 1842:

Dr. Channing has put forth a glorious pamphlet on the 'Creole,' in reply to Webster's sophistical despatch.

One feels proud of being a countryman of Channing His spirit is worthy of the Republic, and does us honor abroad. He is a noble elevation, which makes the pulses throb. The paltry uncertain, shifting principles of Webster's letter are unworthy of him. The question of slavery is getting to be the absorbing one among us; and growing out of this is that other of the Union. People now talk about the value of the Union, and the North has begun to return the taunts of the South. . . .

The treaty is concluded, and peace now smiles over the two countries. . . Webster, it is presumed, will resign his office; but nobody can tell what he will do. He is deeply in debt, and with habits that will now render professional exertion irksome. From his fate we may learn that office is not worth seeking.—*Memoirs II, p. 205, 221.*

To Dr. Samuel G. Howe, he wrote, May 31, 1844, in this language:

. . . The junction between Clay and Webster, strengthens the Whig cause. I can not doubt that Clay will be elected. Tyler's weakness has become wickedness. He is governed by prejudice, selfishness, and vanity—playing with the great powers of the State, confided to him in sacred trust for the good of all, with a view only to what he supposes his individual interest, and sacrificing men and measures as if they were pawns. Oh! When will vulgar selfishness be cast down and trodden under foot, and when shall we find rulers whose eyes will be placed singly on the good of humanity? The Texas treaty will be rejected by the Senate. . . .

Let us put an iron heel upon the serpent of religious bigotry, trying to hug our schools in its insidious coils. . . *Memoirs II, p. 307.*

To Horace Mann, he wrote, in 1845:

. . . We have learned from you the priceless value of the *common schools.* You have taught us most especially that the conservation of republican institutions depends on the knowledge and virtue of the people. You have taught us, by most interesting details and considerations, that the wealth of the country

is augmented, and that the arm of its industry is nerved, in proportion to the diffusion of knowledge; so that each humble schoolhouse is to be regarded, not only as a nursery of souls, but a mine of riches. . . . *Memoirs, II, p. 325.*

To his brother George, in November, 1845:

The spirit of Antislavery promises soon to absorb all New England. Massachusetts will never give her vote for another slaveholder. The cotton lords will interfere, but they will at last be borne away by the rising tide; but this cannot be immediately. You will be at home, and an actor in the conflict that approaches.

In the Free Soil Convention, in Massachusetts, in 1849, he said, in part:

The efforts to place the national government on the side of freedom have received little sympathy from corporations, or from persons largely interested in them, but have rather encountered their opposition, sometimes concealed, sometimes open, often bitter and vindictive. It is easy to explain this. In corporations is the money-power of the Commonwealth. Thus far the instincts of property have proved stronger in Massachusetts than the instinct of freedom. The money-power has joined hands with the slave-power. Selfish, grasping, subtile, tyrannical, like its ally, it will not brook opposition. It claims the Commonwealth as its own, and too successfully enlists in its support, that needy talent and easy virtue which are required to maintain its sway.—*Memoirs, Vol. III, p. 187.*

In 1850 he wrote:

The Slavery question has become paramount here at last. The Slave states threaten to dissolve the Union if Slavery is prohibited by Congress in the new territories or abolished in the District of Columbia. I trust that Congress will do its duty, regardless of threats. What the results may be it is impossible to determine. . . . *Memoirs III, p. 211.*

To William Jay, March 23, 1850:

I thank you very much for writing that letter on Mr. Webster's speech. It will be read extensively, and will do great good. You expose his inconsistency and

turpitude in a manner that must sink into the soul of the great apostate. Horace Mann writes that all of the Northern Whigs out of the three great cities are against that speech.—*Ibid., p. 213.*

In his Faneuil Hall speech of 1850, he used these words:

. . . We are told that the Slavery question is settled. Yes, *settled, settled,*—that is the word. *Nothing, sir, can be settled which is not right.* Nothing can be settled which is against freedom. Nothing can be settled which is against the divine law. God, nature, and all the holy sentiments of the heart repudiate any such false-seeming settlement.—*Ibid., p. 229.*

To John Bigelow, he wrote, January 21, 1851:

. . . The charge used with most effect against me is that I am a "disunionist;" but the authors of this know its falsehood—it is all a sham to influence voters. My principles are, in the words of Franklin, 'to step to the verge of the Constitution to discourage every species of traffic in human flesh." I am a constitutionalist and a unionist, and have always been.—*Ibid., pp. 239-40.*

To Geo. Sumner, 1851:

On the tariff I am absolutely uncommitted. Mr. Henry Cabot, an old manufacturer, told me yesterday that he and others were satisfied that 'protection was a fallacy;' and that William Appleton had said that his vote could not be had for a change in the present tariff. Mr. Cabot thought the subject would not come up in the next session.—*Ibid., p. 254.*

Concerning Kossuth, he wrote, in 1852:

Kossuth produces a great impression by personal presence and speech, but confesses that his mission has failed. It failed under bad counsels, from his asking too much. . . . When the time comes that we can strike a blow for any good cause I shall be ready; but meanwhile our true policy is sympathy with the liberal movement everywhere, and this declared without mincing or reserve. . . .

My desire was to welcome him warmly and sympathetically but at the same time to hold fast to the pacific policy of our country.—*Ibid., p. 271.*

After moving the following amendments to the appropriation bill:

Provided that no such allowance shall be authorized for any expense incurred for executing the Act of September 18, 1850, for the surrender of fugitives from service or labor, which said Act is hereby repealed.

He began his first great speech in the Senate in these words:

And now at last, among these final crowded days of our duties here, but at this earliest opportunity I am to be heard,—not as a favor, but as a right. The graceful usages of this body may be abandoned, but the established privileges of debate cannot be abridged; parliamentary courtesy may be forgotten, but parliamentary law must prevail. The subject is broadly before the Senate; by the blessings of God it shall be discussed. . . .

And now, sir, let us interview the field over which we have passed. We have seen that any compromise, finally disclosing the discussion of slavery under the Constitution, is tyrannical, absurd and impotent; that as slavery can exist only by virtue of positive law, and it has no such support in the Constitution, it cannot exist within the national jurisdiction; that the Constitution nowhere recognized property in man, and that, according to its true interpretation, freedom and not slavery is national, while slavery and not freedom is sectional; that in this spirit the national government was first organized under Washington, himself an abolitionist, surrounded by abolitionists, while the whole country, by its churches, its colleges, its literature, and all its best voices, was united against slavery, and the national flag at that time. . . .

The Slave Act violates the Constitution and shocks the public conscience. With modesty, and yet with firmness, let me add, sir, it offends against the divine law. No such enactment is entitled to support. . . .

Memoirs, III, pp. 293, 297, 298.

In regard to secret sessions in the Senate, he spoke as follows, 1853:

The limitation proposed seems adequate to all exigencies, while the general rule will be publicity. Exec-

utive sessions with closed doors, shrouded from the public gaze and public intrusion, constitute an exceptional part of our system, too much in harmony with the proceedings of other governments less liberal in character. The genius of our institutions requires publicity. . . . *Memoirs, III, p. 321.*

In his Finger Point from Plymouth Rock, he said:

Standing on Plymouth Rock, at their great anniversary, we cannot fail to be elevated by their example. . . . Better the despised Pilgrim, a fugitive for freedom, than the halting politician, forgetful of principle, 'with a Senate at his heels.'—*Memoirs, III, p. 333.*

Concerning the Repeal of the Missouri Compromise he used the following language:

You observe that the Nebraska Bill opens anew the whole slavery question. Cannot something be done to arouse our legislature to resolutions affirming their original position in 1819? Here all is uncertain. I have a hope that it may be tabled at once. The threat is to push it to a vote without delay. . . .

More clearly than ever before, I now penetrate that great future when slavery must disappear. Proudly I discern the flag of my country as it ripples in every breeze,—at last in reality as in name, the flag of freedom, undoubted, pure and irresistible. . . . *Memoirs, III, pp. 361, 372.*

Concerning foreign born citizens, he said:

With this simple explanation, I cannot place any check upon the welcome to foreigners. . . . There are our broad lands, stretching toward the setting sun; let them come and take them. Ourselves children of the Pilgrims of a former generation, let us not turn from the Pilgrims of the present. Let the home founded by our emigrant fathers continue open in its many mansions to the emigrants of today. . . .

A party which, beginning in secrecy, interferes with religious belief, and founds a discrimination on the accident of birth, is not the party for us. . . . *Memoirs, III, pp. 422, 423.*

In 1856, he wrote to C. F. Adams:

. . . At last Banks is elected. I was present when he was conducted to his chair. It was a proud historic moment. For the first time during years there seems to be a North. I fancied I saw the star glittering over his head. His appearance, voice, and manner were in admirable harmony with the occasion. *Memoirs, III, p. 431.*

In 1856 he wrote to Theodore Parker in these despairing words:

I have read and admired your speech. It is a whole sheaf of spears against slavery. Alas! the tyranny over us is complete. When you read this, I shall be saying to the Senate, 'They will not!' Would that I had your strength! But I shall pronounce the most thorough phillipic ever uttered in a legislative body. *Memoirs, III, p. 439.*

The following extracts relate to his speech on Kansas, and its results:

The strife is no longer local, but national. Even now, while I speak, portents lower in the horizon, threatening to darken the land, which already palpitates with the mutterings of civil war. . . .

Thus was the crime consummated. Slavery stands erect, clanking its chains on the Territory of Kansas, surrounded by a code of death, and trampling upon all cherished liberties, whether of speech, the press, the bar, the trial by jury, or the electoral franchise. . . .

Even now the black flag of the land-pirates from Missouri wave at the mast head; in their laws you hear the pirate yell and see the flash of the pirate knife; while, incredible to relate, the President, gathering the slave power at his back, testifies a pirate sympathy.

. . . I as an American citizen shall no longer be impotent against outrage. In just regard for free labor, which you would blast by deadly contact with slave labor; in rescue of fellow-citizens now subjugated to tyrannical usurpation; in dutiful respect for the early fathers, these aspirations are ignobly thwarted; in the name of the Constitution outraged, of the laws trampled down, of justice banished, of humanity de-

graded, of peace destroyed, of freedom crushed to the the earth, and in the name of the Heavenly Father, whose service is perfect freedom,—I make this last appeal.—*Memoirs, III, pp. 442, 443, 444, 452.*

Mr. Chandler spoke of the effect of the attack on Sumner in these words:

That gentleman in Washington, who now lies upon a bed of pain, whose life maybe is hanging in the balance, needs no sympathy from us. Every drop of blood shed by him in this disgraceful affair has raised ten thousand armed men; every gash upon that forehead will be covered with a political crown; let it be resisted as much as it may be resisted here or elsewhere. This matter is raised far above and beyond all personal considerations. It is a matter of trifling consequence to Mr. Sumner; it makes those who love him love him more,—and no man is more loved or more to be considered, as far as the affections or friendships are concerned. Yet personal feelings are of little or no consequence in this outrage. It is a blow not merely at Massachusetts, a blow not merely at the name and fame of our common country; it is a blow at constitutional liberty all the world over,—it is a stab at the cause of universal freedom.—*Memoirs, III, p. 499.*

Concerning the Cuban question as it appeared in 1859 to Sumner, we have these words:

Everything tends to make the Cuban question the pivot of the anti-slavery cause. If Cuba falls into the hands of the American slave-masters, the whole system of slavery will acquire a new lease of life and power. . . .

All this can be arrested at once, and the slave trade also, if Spain can in any way be induced to follow the British example and to declare emancipation in this island. That would be the greatest blow ever dealt at slavery. Indeed, that blow would be mortal. I do not think slavery could long survive in the United States. . . . *Memoirs, III, p. 568.*

Sumner was recognized, for the first time, as a great orator in his Fourth of July address of 1845. In part he said:

. . With this aim, and believing that I can in no other way so fitly fulfill the trust reposed in me to-day, I propose to consider *what, in our age, are the true objects of national ambition,—what is truly National Honor, National Glory,*—WHAT IS THE TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS. I would not depart from the modesty that becomes me, yet I am not without hope that I may do something to rescue these terms, now so powerful over the minds of men, from mistaken objects, especially from deeds of war, and the extension of empire, that they may be applied to works of justice and beneficence, which is better than war or empire. . . .

Can there be in our age any peace that is not honorable, any war that is not dishonorable? The true honor of a nation is conspicuous only in deeds of justice and beneficence, securing and advancing human happiness. In the clear eye of that Christian judgment which must yet prevail, vain are the victories of War, infamous its spoils. He is the benefactor, and worthy of honor, who carries comfort to wretchedness, dries the tear of sorrow, relieves the unfortunate, feeds the hungry, clothes the naked, does justice, enlightens the ignorant, unfastens the fetters of the slave, and finally, by virtuous genius, in art, literature, science, enlivens and exhalts the hours of life, or, by generous example, inspires a love for God and man. . . . *Sumner's Works, Vol. I, pp. 7, 9, 10.*

Anti-slavery duties of the Whig Party, September 23, 1846:

. . . The time, I believe, has gone by, when the question is asked, *What has the North to do with Slavery?* It might almost be answered, that, politically, it has little to do with anything else,—so are all the acts of our Government, connected, directly or indirectly, with this institution. Slavery is everywhere. Appealing to the Constitution, it enters the Halls of Congress, in the disproportionate representation of the Slave States. It holds its disgusting mart at Washington, in the shadow of the Capitol, under the legislative jurisdiction of the Nation,—of the North as well as the South. It sends its miserable victims over the

high seas, from the ports of Virginia to the ports of Louisiana, beneath the protecting flag of the Republic. It presumes to follow into the free state those fugitives who, filled with the inspiration of Freedom, seek our alters for safety; nay, more, with profane hands it seizes those who have never known the name of slave, freemen of the North, and dooms them to irredeemable bondage. It insults and expels from its jurisdiction honored representatives from Massachusetts, seeking to secure for her colored citizens the peaceful safeguard of the Union. It assumes at pleasure to build up new slaveholding states, striving perpetually to widen its area, while professing to extend the area of Freedom. It has brought upon the country war with Mexico, with its enormous expenditures and more enormous guilt. By the spirit of union among its supporters, it controls the affairs of Government,—interferes with the cherished interests of the North, enforcing and then refusing protection to her manufactures,—makes and unmakes Presidents,—usurps to itself the larger portion of all offices of honor and profit, both in the army and navy, and also in the civil department,—and stamps upon our whole country the character, before the world, of that monstrous anomaly and mockery, a *slaveholding republic*, with the living truths of Freedom on its lips and the dark mark of Slavery on its brow.—*Works, Vol. I, pp. 307, 308.*

Wrongful Declaration of War against Mexico:

. . . In the condition of things, the way of safety, just and honorable, was by constant withdrawal from the Rio Grande to the Nueces. Congress should have spoken like Washington, when General Braddock, staggered by the peril of the moment, asked the youthful soldier, "What shall I do, Colonel Washington?" "RETREAT, Sir! RETREAT, Sir!" was the earnest reply. The American forces should have been directed to *retreat*,—not from any human force, but from *wrongdoing;* and this would have been a true victory.—*Works I, p. 319.*

In a later speech on the same subject, he speaks in part as follows:

. . . But the war is not unconstitutional, it is unjust, and it is vile in object and character. It had its

origin in a well-known series of measures to extend and perpetuate Slavery. It is a war which must ever be odious in history, beyond the outrages of brutality which disgrace other nations and times. It is a slave-driving war. In principle it is only a little above those miserable conflicts between barbarian chiefs of Central Africa to obtain slaves for the inhuman markets of Brazil. Such a war must be accursed in the sight of God. Why is it not accursed in the sight of man?

We are told that the country is engaged in the war, and therefore it must be maintained, or, as it is sometimes expressed, vigorously prosecuted. In other words, the violation of the Constitution, and the outrage upon justice sink out of sight, and we are urged to these same acts again. By what necromancy do these pass from wrong to right? In what book of morals is it written, that what is bad before it is undertaken be comes righteous merely from the circumstances that it is commenced. Who on earth is authorized to transmute wrong into right? Who admits the unconstitutionality and injustice of the war, and yet sanctions its prosecution, must approve the Heaven-defying sentiment, "Our country, right or wrong." Can this be the sentiment of Boston? If so, in vain are her children nurtured in the churches of the Pilgrims, in vain fed from the common table of knowledge bountifully supplied by our common schools. Who would profess allegiance to wrong? Who would defy allegiance to right? Right is one of the attributes of God, or rather it is part of his Divinity immortal as himself. The mortal can not be higher than the immortal. Had this sentiment been received by our English defenders in the war of the Revolution, no fiery tongues of Chatham, Burke, Fox, or Camden would have been heard in our behalf. Their great testimony would have failed. All would have been silenced, while crying that the country, right or wrong, must be carried through the war. . . . *Works I, pp. 377, 378.*

Necessity of political action against the slave power and the extension of slavery, September 29, 1847:

Mr. President,—It is late, and I am sorry to trespass on unwilling attention. The importance of the cause

is my apology. The question is, How shall we express our opposition to the Extension of Slavery? Here it is satisfactory to know that there can be no embarrassment from constitutional scruples. It is not proposed to interfere with Slavery in any constitutional stronghold, or to touch any so-called compromise of the Constitution.

Is it not strange, Mr. President, that we, in this nineteenth century of the Christian era, in a country whose heroic charter declares that "all men are created equal," under whose Constitution one of whose express objects is to "secure the blessings of liberty,"—is it not passing strange that we should be occupied now in considering how best to prevent the opening of new markets for human flesh? . . . The Missouri compromise, the annexation of Texas, the war with Mexico, are only specimens of trouble from the Slave Power. . . . The Slave Power is the Imprisoned Giant of our Constitution. . . .

This brings me directly to the point, How shall we make our opposition felt? How shall it become vital and palpable? On the present occasion we can only declare our course. . . . We must carry them to the ballot box, and bring our candidates to their standard. . . . Our motto must be, "Principles, and those *only* who will maintain them." . . . *Works, Vol. II, pp. 56, 57, 59, 61.*

Union against the extension of slavery:

By the Slave Power I understand that combination of persons, or, perhaps, of politicians, whose animating principal is the perpetuation and extension of Slavery, with the advancement of Slaveholders.

I will not dwell upon the manner in which General Taylor was forced upon the late Whig party. This has been amply done by others. . . . Yes! it was brought about by an unhallowed union—conspiracy let it be called, between two remote sections; between the politicians of the Southwest and the politicians of the Northeast,—between the cotton-planters and fleshmongers of Louisiana and Mississippi and the cotton-spinners and traffikers of New England,—between the lords of the lash and the lords of the loom. . . . To my mind the way is plain. The lovers of Freedom

from both parties, and irrespective of all party associations, must unite, and by a new combination, congenial to the Constitution, oppose both candidates. This will be the FREEDOM POWER, whose single object will be to resist the SLAVE POWER. We will put them face to face, and let them grapple. Who can doubt the result. . . . It is clear that the only question of present practical interest arises from the usurpations of the Slave Power and the efforts to extend Slavery. This is the vital question at this time. *It is the question of questions.* . . . *Works, II, pp. 77, 81, 82, 85.*

The party of freedom:

. . . It is said that we have but one idea. This I deny. But admitting that it is so, are we not, with our one idea, better than a party with no ideas at all? And what is our one idea? It is the idea which combined our fathers on the heights of Bunker Hill,—which inspired Lafayette,—which carried Washington through a seven years' war,—which with coals of fire touched the lips of Adams, Otis, and Patrick Henry. Ours is an idea at least noble and elevating; it is an idea which draws in its train, virtue, goodness, and all the charities of life, all that makes a home of improvement and happiness. . . .

We found now a new party. Its corner-stone is Freedom. Its broad, all-sustaining arches are Truth, Justice, and Humanity. Like the ancient Roman Capitol, at once Temple and Citadel, it shall be the fit shrine for the genius of American institutions.—*Works II, pp. 145, 146.*

Importance of a free-soil organization:

. . .. This is the case now. The principles of Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin, the security of our Constitution, the true fame of our country, the interests of labor, the cause of Freedom, Humanity, Right, Morals, Religion, God, all these are now at stake. Holier cause has never appeared in history. To it I offer not vows only, but my best efforts, wherever they can be effectual. . . *Works, II, pp. 150, 151.*

War system of the commonwealth of nations, May 28, 1849:

Only when we contemplate war in this light can we fully perceive its combined folly and wickedness. Let me bring this home to your minds. Boston and Cambridge are adjoining towns, separated by the river Charles. In the event of controversy between these different jurisdictions, the Municipal Law established a judicial tribunal, and not War, as Arbiter. Ascending even higher, in the event of controversy between two different counties, as between Essex and Middlesex, and same Municipal Law establishes a judicial tribunal, and not War, as arbiter. Ascending yet higher, in the event of controversy between two different States in the Union, the Constitution established a judicial tribunal, the Supreme Court of the United States, and not War, as arbiter. But now mark: at the next stage there is a change of arbiter. In the event of controversy between two different States in the Commonwealth of Nations, the Supreme law establishes, not a judicial tribunal, but War, as arbiter. War is the institution *established* for the determination of justice between two nations. . . .

Recognizing the irrational and unchristian character of War as established arbiter between towns, counties and states, we learn to condemn it as established arbiter between nations. If wrong in one case, it must be wrong in the other.—*Works II, pp. 189, 190, 191.*

Where liberty is, there is my party:

. . . It was the sentiment of Benjamin Franklin, that apostle of Freedom uttered during the trials of the Revolution, "Where liberty is, there is my country." I doubt not that each of you will be ready to respond, in similar strain, "Where liberty is, there is my party." . . .—*Works, II, p. 281.*

A congress of nations, with disarmament:

"PETITION FOR PEACE.

"*To the Honorable Senate (or H. of R.) of the United States:*

"The undersigned, inhabitants (or citizens, or legal voters) of ——— in the State of ———, deploring the manifold evils of war, and believing it possible to supersede its alleged necessity, as an Arbiter of Justice among the nations, by the timely adoption of wise

and feasible substitutes, respectfully request your honorable body to take such action as you may deem best in favor of Stipulated Arbitration, or a Congress of Nations, for the accomplishment of this most desirable end." . . . *Works, II, p. 396.*

Our immediate anti-slavery duties, November 6, 1850:

. . . It is a mistake to say, as is often charged, that we seek to interfere, through Congress, with Slavery in the States, or in any way to direct the legislation of Congress upon subjects not within its jurisdiction. Our *political* aims, as well as our *political* duties, are coextensive with our *political* responsibilities. And since we at the North are responsible for Slavery, wherever it exists under the jurisdiction of Congress, it is unpardonable in us not to exert every power we possess to enlist Congress against it.

Looking at details:—

We demand, first and foremost, the instant Repeal of the Fugitive Slave Bill. (Cheers.)

We demand the Abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia. (Cheers.) We demand of Congress the exercise of its time-honored power to prohibit Slavery in the Territories. (Cheers.)

We demand of Congress that it shall refuse to receive any new Slave State into the Union. (Cheers, repeated.)

We demand the Abolition of the Domestic Slave Trade, so far as it can be constitutionally reached, but particularly on the high seas under the National Flag.

And, generally, we demand from the National Government, the exercise of all constitutional power to relieve itself from responsibility of Slavery. And yet one thing further must be done. The Slave Power must be overturned,—so that the National Government may be put openly, actively, and perpetually on the side of Freedom. (Prolonged applause.) . . . *Works, Vol. II, pp. 415, 416.*

QUESTIONS

1. To what generation of American statesmen does Sumner belong? 2. How can you determine?

1. What kind of a student was Sumner? 2. What studies did he like best? 3. What was his scholarship at fifteen? 4. Discuss his personal appearance. 5.

What can you learn of him from his letter while at college? 6. What do you learn of Harvard customs? 7. Discuss his moral qualities. 8. His social. 9. Was he a thorough student? 10. What did he think of method in study? 11. What occupation did he believe was the noblest?

1. What was his first impression of Washington politics? 2. What of Slavery? 3. What reasons does he give to account for the growing Abolitionism of the North? 4. What was his impression of the Campaign of 1840? 5. Did he find country or party first thought of? 6. Find out what the "Creole" affair was. 7. Give his argument on the case. 8. Make a list of the evils he thinks he sees in American political life. 9 What was the great work of Horace Mann? 10. What did he think of Webster's speech of 1850? 11. When is a question settled? Was his answer always correct? 12. What did he think of the tariff?

1. Make a list of all the points he makes against slavery. 2. Make a list of the *means* he would use to destroy slavery. 3. Were his attacks on slavery of such a nature as to anger those attacked? 4. What was the result of the speech on Kansas? 5. How would he use Cuba if possible? Why?

1. What did Sumner think constituted the "True Grandeur of Nations"? 2. Summarize his arguments for peace. 3. What can be said on the other side? 4. Trace his views in regard to Mexican War. 5. Have his predictions been fulfilled?

1. Estimate Sumner's character from his speeches 2. Estimate his oratorical power from them also. 3. Was he a narrow, or broad minded man? 4. Compare him with either Adams, Webster, Clay, or Calhoun.

STEPHEN ARNOLD DOUGLAS

Born in Vermont, 1813. Went to Illinois, 1834. Member of the Illinois legislature, 1836-1838. Judge of the supreme court of Illinois, 1841-1843. Member of House of Representatives, 1843-1846. Senator, 1846-1861. Candidate for nomination for President, 1852, 1856. Candidate for President, 1860. Strongest supporter of the doctrine of "Popular Sovereignty." Author of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, 1854. Opponent of admission of Kansas under the Lecompton constitution, 1858. Series of debates with Lincoln, 1858. Died, 1860.

CHAPTER VII

STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS

DOUGLAS belonged to the same generation as Sumner, Seward, Chase, and Lincoln. Like them he is best known by the part he took in the great slavery struggle; but, unlike them, he was an opponent of the agitation of the subject, and bitterly opposed to the abolitionists. Douglas was born in New England, and educated in its limits. At the age of twenty he gave up his ambition for a college course, although he was well prepared in the classics and mathematics, and turned to the study of law. He, like nearly all this group of great men, came from the ranks of the middle class, and from the farm.

Before he was twenty-one he started west, and at length arrived in Illinois with less than one dollar in his pocket. However, in less than ten years he was one of the leaders of the Democratic party in the state, with a reputation that already extended beyond its borders.

The following extracts illustrate some phases of his life; but, as in the cases of the other men of whom we have studied, the picture is too brief to give more than an outline of his career and labors.

Douglas defends the act of Jackson in suspending the writ of *Habeas Corpus*, at New Orleans, in the war of 1812, in these words:

They have been pleased to stigmatize this act of justice to the distinguished patriot and hero as a humbug —a party trick—a political movement, intended to operate upon the next Presidential election. These imputations are as unfounded as they are uncourteous, and I hurl them back . . . upon any man who is capable of harboring, . . . such a sentiment. . . . A question involving the right of a country to use the means necessary to its defense . . . is too vitally important to be yielded without an inquiry into the nature and source of the fatal restriction which is to deprive a nation of the power of self-preservation. The proposition contended for by the Opposition is, that the general in command, to whose protection are committed the country, and the lives, property and liberties of the citizens within his district, may not declare martial law when it is ascertained that its exercise, and it alone, can save all from total destruction. . . . For one, I maintain that in the exercise of this power, General Jackson did not violate the Constitution, nor assume to himself any authority which was not fully authorized and legalized by his position, his duty and the unavoidable necessity of the case . . . He had a right to declare martial law when it was ascertained and acknowledged that nothing but martial law would enable him to defend the city and the country. . . . It does not imply the right to suspend the laws and civil tribunals at pleasure. The right grows out of the necessity; and when the necessity fails, the right ceases. . . There are exigencies in the history of nations as well as individuals when necessity becomes the paramount law to which all other considerations must yield. It is that first great law of nature, which authorizes a man to defend his life, . . . by every means in his power. . . . Does the man live who will have the hardihood to question his patriotism, his honesty, the purity of his motives in every act he performed, and every power he exercised on that trying occasion? While none dare impeach his motives, they tell us he assumed almost unlimited power.

I commend him for it; the exigency required it. I admire that elevation of soul which rises above all personal consideration, and, regardless of consequences,

stakes life, and honor, and glory upon the issue, when the salvation of the country depends upon the result.—*Speech of Douglas, Jan. 7, 1844, Cong. Globe, Cited in Sheahan's Life of Douglas, pp. 61, 62, 63, 69.*

The Mexican War:

My object (said he) is to vindicate our government and country from the aspersions and calumnies which have been cast upon them . . . in connection with the causes which have led to the existing war with Mexico. I prefer to meet and repel those charges at once, . . . and to demonstrate, so far as my feeble abilities will enable me to do so, that our government has not been in the wrong, and Mexico in the right, in the origin and progress of the pending controversy. They profess great anxiety for the triumph of our arms, but they denounce the war—the cause in which our country is engaged—as "unholy, unrighteous, and damnable". . . .

Not only have we never done an act of an unfriendly character toward Mexico, but I confidently assert that, from the very moment of the existence of the republic, we have allowed to pass unimproved no opportunity of doing Mexico an act of kindness. I will not now enumerate the acts of that character. . . . If this government choose to forget them, I will not recall them. While such has been our course to Mexico, it is with pain I am forced to say that the open violation of the rights of American citizens by the authorities of Mexico have been greater for the last fifteen years than those of all the governments of Christendom united; and yet we have left the redress of all these multiplied and accumulated wrongs to friendly negotiations, without having ever intimated a disposition to resort to force. . . .

They express great sympathy for Mexico; profess to regard her an injured and persecuted nation—the victim of American injustice and aggression. They have no sympathy for the widows and orphans whose husbands and fathers have been robbed and murdered by the Mexican authorities; no sympathy with our countrymen who have dragged out miserable lives within the walls of her dungeons, without crime and without trial; no indignation at the outrages upon

our commerce and shipping, and the insults to our national flag; no resentment at the violation of treaties and the invasion of our territory. . . . I will now proceed to examine the arguments by which the gentleman from Ohio, . . . pretends to justify their foreign sympathies. They assume that the Rio del Norte was not the boundary line between Texas and Mexico. . . .

I must, therefore, be permitted to adhere to my original position that the treaty of peace and the boundaries [agreed upon] between Santa Ana and the Texan government in May, 1836, was binding on the Mexican nation, it having been executed by the government *de facto* for the time being.

Mr. Adams. Has not the treaty with Santa Ana been since discarded by the Mexican government?

Mr. Douglas. I presume it has, for I am not aware of any treaty or compact which that government ever entered into that she did not afterwards either violate or repudiate. . . .

I am not now to be diverted from the real point in controversy by a discussion of the question whether the Rio del Norte was the boundary to its source. My present object is to repel the calumnies which have been urged against our government, to place our country in the right and the enemy in the wrong, before the civilized world, according to the truth and justice of the case. I have exposed these calumnies by reference to the acts and admissions of our accusers. . . I have shown that Texas always claimed the Rio del Norte as her boundary during the existence of the republic, and that Mexico on several occasions recognized it as such in the most solemn and direct manner. . . .

All is wrong in their eyes. Their country is always wrong, and its enemies right. It has ever been so. It was so in the last war with Great Britain. Then it was unbecoming a moral and religious people to rejoice at the success of American arms. We were wrong, in their estimation, in the French Indemnity case, in the Florida war, in all the Indian wars, and now in the Mexican war. I despair of ever seeing my country again in the right, if they [the Whigs] are to

be the oracles.—*Cited in Sheahan, pp. 75, 78, 80, 81, 84, 89, 90.*

The Oregon Boundary:

It therefore becomes us to put this nation in a state of defense; and when we are told that this will lead to war, all I have to say is this, violate no treaty stipulations, nor any principal of the law of nations; preserve the honor and integrity of the country, but, at the same time, assert our right to the last inch and then, if war comes, let it come. . . . I would blot out the lines on the map which now mark our national boundaries on this continent, and make the area of liberty as broad as the continent itself. I would not suffer petty rival republics to grow up here, engendering jealousy of each other, . . . I do not wish to go beyond the great ocean—beyond those boundaries which the God of nature has marked out, I would limit myself only by that boundary which is so clearly defined by nature.

. . .

Our federal system is admirably adapted to the whole continent; and while I would not violate the laws of nations, nor treaty stipulations, nor in any manner tarnish the national honor, I would exert all legal and honorable means to drive Great Britain . . from the continent of North America and extend the limits of the republic from ocean to ocean. I wonld make this an ocean bound republic and have no more disputes about boundaries, or "red lines" upon the maps.—*Cited in Sheahan, pp. 92, 93.*

Territorial Expansion; The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty; February 14, 1853:

With an avowed policy, of thirty years standing, that no future European Colonization is to be permitted in America—affirmed when there was no opportunity for enforcing it and abandoned whenever a case was presented for carrying it into practical effect—it is now proposed to beat another retreat under cover of terrible threats of awful consequences when the offence shall be repeated. . . .

That we would resist any attempt to transfer the island of Cuba to any European power, either with or without the consent of Spain, there is, I trust no question in

the mind of any American. . . . That the United States do not meditate any designs upon the island . . . has been demonstrated to the world in a manner that forbids the necessity for a disclaimer of unworthy and perfidious purposes on our part. . . . The whole system of European colonization rests upon seizure, violence and fraud. European powers hold nearly all their colonies by the one or the other of these tenures. . . . Now sir a few words with regard to the island of Cuba. . . . I have often said, and now repeat that, so long as the island of Cuba is content to remain loyal to the crown of Spain, be it so. I have no desire, no wish to disturb that relation. I have always said, and now repeat that, whenever the people of the island of Cuba shall show themselves worthy of freedom by asserting and maintaining their independence and establishing republican institutions, my heart, my sympathies, my prayers are with them for the accomplishment of that object. I have often said, and now repeat that, when that independence shall have been established, if it shall be necessary to their interest or safety to apply as Texas did for annexation, I shall be ready to do by them as we did by Texas, and receive them into the Union.—*Cited in Sheahan, pp. 101, 109, 110.*

The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, March 10, 1853:

You may make as many treaties as you please to fetter the limbs of this giant republic, and she will burst them all from her, . . . What is the use of your guarantee that you will never erect any fortifications in Central America; never annex, occupy or colonize any portion of that country? How do you know that you can avoid doing it? If you make the canal, I ask you if American citizens will not settle along its line; whether they will not build up towns at each terminus; . . . whether American principles and American institutions will not be firmly planted there? . . . But, so certain as this republic exists, so certain as we remain a united people, so certain as the laws of progress which have raised us from a mere handful to a mighty nation shall continue to govern our action, just so certain are these events to be worked out, and you will be compelled to extend your protection in that direction.

Sir, I am not desirous of hastening the day. I am not impatient of the time when it shall be realized. I do not wish to give any additional impulse to our progress. We are going fast enough. But I wish our policy, our laws, our institutions, should keep up with the advance in science, in the mechanical arts, in agriculture and in everything that tends to make us a great and powerful nation. Let us look the future in the face and let us prepare to meet that which can not be avoided.—*Cited in Sheahan, pp. 112 113.*

Filibustering, 1858:

Sir, I have no fancy for this system of filibustering. I believe its tendency is to defeat the very object they have in view, . . . I would like to see the boundaries of this republic extended gradually and steadily, as fast as we can Americanize the countries we can acquire and make their inhabitants loyal American citizens when we get them. Faster than that I would not desire to go. . . . I believe the interests of commerce, of civilization, every interest which civilized nations hold dear, would be benefited by expansion; but still I desire to see it done regularly and lawfully, and I apprehend that these expeditions have a tendency to check it. . . . —*Cited in Sheahan, p. 120.*

Closing words of his speech at New Orleans, December, 1858:

It is our destiny to have Cuba, and it is folly to debate the question. It naturally belongs to the American continent. It guards the mouth of the Mississippi river, which is the heart of the American continent, and the body of the American nation. Its acquisition is a matter of time only. Our government should adopt the policy of receiving Cuba as soon as a fair and just opportunity shall be presented. Whether that opportunity occur next year or the year after, whenever the occasion arises and the opportunity presents itself, it should be embraced.

The same is true of Central America and Mexico. It will not do to say we have territory enough. . . . We acquired Louisiana and Florida, Texas and California, just as the increase in our population and our interests demanded. . . .

I do not want territory any faster than we can occupy, Americanize and civilize it. I am no filibusterer. . . .

I am in favor of expansion, . . . but I am not in favor of that policy unless the great principle of non-intervention and the right of the people to decide the question of slavery and all other domestic questions for themselves shall be maintained. If that principle prevail, we have a future before us more glorious than that of any other people that ever existed. . . . It will gain new strength with every state brought into the confederacy. Then there will be peace and harmony between the free states and the slave states. The more degrees of latitude and longitude embraced beneath our Constitution, the better. The greater the variety of productions, the better; for then we shall have the principles of free trade apply to the important staples of the world, making us the greatest planting as well as the greatest manufacturing, the greatest commercial as well as the greatest agricultural power on the globe. . . . *Cited in Sheahan, pp. 122, 123.*

The Compromise of 1850: speech in the Senate:

I believe the people have a right to do as they please when they form their Constitution, and, no matter what domestic regulations they may make, they have a right to come into the Union, provided there is nothing in their Constitution which violates the Constitution of the United States. . . . I have always held that the people have a right to settle these questions as they choose, not only when they come into the Union as a state, but that they should be permitted to do so while a territory. . . .

The Senator from Mississippi puts a question to me as to what number of people there must be in a territory before this right to govern themselves accrues. Without determining the precise number, I will assume that the right ought to accrue to the people at the moment they have enough to constitute a government; . . . If, sir, there are enough to require a government, and to authorize you to allow them to govern themselves, there are enough to govern themselves upon the subject of negroes as well as concerning other

species of property and other descriptions of institutions. . . . —*Cited in Sheahan, pp. 137, 142, 143.*

Speech in Senate, December 23, 1851, on the Foot Resolutions. Explains why he did not vote for the Fugitive Slave Act:

Whatever political sins I may at any time have committed, I think I may safely assert that no senator ever doubted my willingness to assume the full measure of responsibility resulting from my official position. The dodging of votes—the attempt to avoid responsibility—is no part of my system of political tactics. And yet, sir, the special organ of the administration has on several occasions accused me, . . . with having dodged the vote on this bill. . . . I have always opposed the introduction of the subject of slavery into the halls of Congress for any purpose—either for discussion or action—except in the cases specified and enjoined by the Constitution of the United States, as in the case of the reclamation of fugitives from labor. . . . My action here since I have been a member of the Senate has been governed by the same principle. Whenever the slavery agitation has been forced upon us, I have always met it fairly, directly and fearlessly and endeavored to apply the proper remedy. Whether the remedy proposed by me has always been the wisest and most appropriate is a fair subject of discussion, and will doubtless give rise to a wide diversity of opinion. . . . It should be borne in mind that the Wilmot Proviso not only proposed to prohibit slavery in the territories while they remained territories, but also went farther, and proposed to insert a stipulation in the treaty with a foreign power pledging the faith of the nation that slavery should never exist in the country acquired, either while it remained in the condition of Territories, or after it should have been admitted into the Union as states on an equal footing with the original states. . . . I was reluctant to give up the Missouri Compromise. . . . But public duty demanded that all considerations of pride, of character, and of opinion should be made subservient to the public peace and tranquillity. I gave it up—reluctantly, to be sure—and conceived the idea of a bill

to admit California as a state, leaving the people to form a constitution and settle the question of slavery afterward to suit themselves. . . . *Cited in Sheahan, pp. 161, 163, 164, 165.*

Principles of the Compromise of 1850, as set forth by Douglas in 1854:

From these provisions it is apparent that the compromise measures of 1850 affirm and rest upon the following propositions:

First—That all questions pertaining to slavery in the territories, and in the new states to be formed therefrom, are to be left to the decision of the people residing therein, . . .

Second—That "all cases involving title to slaves" and "questions of personal freedom" are referred to the adjudication of the local tribunals, with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Third—That the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, in respect to fugitives from service, is to be carried into faithful execution in all the "organized territories" the same as in the states.—*Cited in Sheahan, p. 189.*

The Kansas-Nebraska Act:

. . . Upon the other point—that pertaining to the question of slavery in the territories—it was the intention of the committee to be equally explicit. We took the principles established by the compromise acts of 1850 as our guide. . . . These measures are established and rest upon the great principles of self-government—that the people should be allowed to decide the questions of their domestic institutions for themselves, subject only to such limitations and restrictions as are imposed by the Constitution of the United States, instead of having them determined by an arbitrary or geographical line. . . .—*Cited in Sheahan, pp. 193, 194, 195.*

Concerning the Chase Amendment to the Kansas-Nebraska Bill:

Now, sir, the true, direct and manly course to meet this question is that suggested by my honorable friend from Illinois—(Mr. Shields). Put in your amendment

that the people of the territories shall be at liberty to exclude or introduce, and if there is anything in the Constitution of the United States which disables a territorial government from introducing slavery, if the honorable senator believes that, if he is sincere in that opinion, there sits a tribunal below us who will pass upon the validity and constitutionality of any act that we may pass.—*Cited in Sheahan, p. 204.*

Extracts from Douglas' great speech of March 3, 1854, a speech which brought from Seward the words, "I have never had so much respect for him (Douglas) as to-night."

The statement to which they seem to attach the most importance, . . . is that, pending the Compromise measures, of 1850, no man in or out of Congress ever dreamed of abrogating the Missouri Compromise; that from that period down to the present session nobody supposed that its validity had been impaired; . . . that at the time of submitting the report and bill to the Senate, on the 4th of January last, neither I nor any member of the Committee ever thought of such a thing; and that we could never be brought up to the point of abrogating the eighth section of the Missouri act until after the senator from Kentucky introduced his amendment to my bill. . . . Will any one of my accusers dare to make this issue and let it be tried by the record? . . .

These measures are predicated on the great fundamental principle that every people ought to possess the right of forming and regulating their own internal concerns and domestic institutions in their own way. . . . [therefore the doctrine of the committee is]

First. That the whole question of slavery should be withdrawn from the halls of Congress, and the political arena, and committed to the arbitrament of those who are immediately interested in and alone responsible for its existence.

Second. The applying this principle to territories and the new states to be formed therefrom, all questions pertaining to slavery were to be referred to the people residing therein.

Third. That the committee proposed to carry these

propositions and principles into effect in the precise language of the Compromise measures of 1850. . . . Mr. President, the Senators from Ohio and Massachusetts (Mr. Chase and Mr. Sumner) have taken the liberty to impeach my motives in bringing forward this measure. I desire to know by what right they arraign me, or by what authority they impute to me other and different motives than those which I have assigned. I have shown from the record that I advocated and voted for the same principles and provisions in the compromise acts of 1850, which are embraced in this bill. I have proven that I put the same construction upon those measures immediately after their adoption that is given in the report which I submitted this session from the Committee on Territories. I have shown that the Legislature of Illinois at its first session, after those measures were enacted, passed resolutions approving them, and declaring that the same great principles of self-government should be incorporated into all territorial organizations. Yet, sir, in the face of these facts, these senators have the hardihood to declare that this was all an "after-thought" on my part, conceived for the first time during the present session; and that the measure is offered as a bid for presidential votes! Are they incapable of conceiving that an honest man can do a right thing from worthy motives? I must be permitted to tell those senators that their experience in seeking political preferment does not furnish a safe rule by which to judge the character and principles of other senators. . . . If, in the language of the report of the Committee, you withdraw the slavery question from the halls of Congress and the political arena, and commit it to the arbitrament of those who are immediately interested in and alone responsible for its consequences, there is nothing left out of which sectional parties can be organized. . . . When the people of the North shall all be rallied under one banner, and the whole South marshalled under another banner, and each section excited to frenzy and madness by hostility to the institutions of the other, then the patriot may well tremble for the perpetuity of the Union. Withdraw the slavery question from the political arena, and remove it to the states and territories each to decide

for itself, such a catastrophe can never happen. Then you will never be able to tell, by any senator's vote for or against any measure, from what state or section of the Union he comes. . . . Mr. President, I have not brought this question forward as a northern man or as a southern man. I am unwilling to recognize such divisions and distinctions. . . .

I have nothing to say about northern rights or southern rights. I know of no such divisions or distinctions under the Constitution.—*Cited in Sheahan, pp. 223, 224, 225, 227, 253, 260.*

In a speech July 4, 1854, at Philadelphia, he used this language in regard to the Know-Nothing Party and its doctrines:

No principle of political action could have been devised more hostile to the genius of our institutions, more repugnant to the Constitution than those which are said to form the test of membership in this Society of "Know-nothings." To proscribe a man in this country on account of his birthplace or religious faith is subversive of all our ideas and principles of civil and religious freedom. It is revolting to our sense of justice and right. It is derogatory to the character of our forefathers, who were all immigrants from the Old World, some at a earlier and some at a later period. . . . And if, after struggling as our forefathers struggled for centuries in their native land against civil and religious persecution, we and our children shall be finally borne down and trampled under the heel of despotism, we can still follow their example—flee to the wilderness and find an asylum in Nebraska, where the principles of self-government have been firmly established in the organic act which recently passed Congress.—*Cited in Sheahan, pp. 269, 271.*

The Government of Kansas:

Hence no state has a right to pass any law or do or authorize any act, with the view to influence or change the domestic policy of any other state or Territory of the Union, more than it would with reference to France or England, or any other foreign state with which we are at peace.

Indeed, every state of this Union, is under higher obligations to observe a friendly forbearance and generous comity toward each other member of the confederacy than the laws of nations can impose on foreign states. While foreign states are restrained from all acts of aggression and unkindness only by the spirit of comity which the laws of nations enjoin upon all friendly powers, we have assumed the additional obligation to obey the Constitution which secures to every state the right to control its own internal affairs. . . —*Cited in Sheahan, p. 290.*

The Lecompton Constitution; Douglas breaks with the President; December 9, 1857:

Sir, my honor is pledged: and before it shall be tarnished I will take whatever consequences personal to myself may come. . . . I will go as far as any of you to save the party. I have as much heart in the great cause that binds us together as any man living. I will sacrifice anything short of principle and honor for the peace of the party; but if the party will not stand by its privileges, its faith, its pledges, I will stand there and abide whatever consequences may result from the position. . . . But, I am told on all sides, "Oh, just wait; the pro-slavery clause will be voted down." That does not obviate any of my objections; it does not diminish any of them. You have no more right to force a free-state Constitution on Kansas than a slave-state Constitution. If Kansas wants a slave-state constitution, she has a right to it; if she wants a free-state Constitution, she has a right to it. It is none of my business which way the Slavery clause is decided. I care not whether it is voted down or voted up. . . . Ignore Lecompton, ignore Topeka; treat both those party movements as irregular and void; pass a fair bill—the one that we framed ourselves when we were acting as a unit; have a fair election—and you will have peace in the Democratic party, and peace throughout the country, in ninety days. Mr. President, I come back to the question, ought we to receive Kansas into the Union with the Lecompton Constitution? Is there satisfactory evidence that it is the act and deed of that people—that it embodies their

will? Is the evidence satisfactory that the people of that Territory have been left perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way? I think not. . . . Article 7, Section 1, of its Constitution, reads: "The right of property is before and higher than any constitutional sanction; and the right of the owner of a slave to such slave and its increase is the same and as inviolable as the right of the owner of any property whatever." . . . The proposition is, that a citizen of Virginia has rights in a free state which a citizen of a free state cannot himself have. . . . If that proposition is true, the creed of the Democratic party is false. The principle of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill is, that "each state and each Territory shall be left perfectly free to form and regulate its domestic institutions in its own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States." I claim that Illinois has the sovereign right to prohibit slavery, a right as undeniable as that the sovereignty of Virginia may authorize its existence. We have the same right to prohibit it that you have to recognize and protect it. . . . I do not recognize the right of the President or his cabinet, no matter what my respect may be for them, to tell me my duty in the Senate Chamber. The President has his duties to perform under the Constitution, and he is responsible to his constituency. A senator has his duties to perform here under the Constitution and according to his oath, and he is responsible to the sovereign state which he represents as his constituency. . . . For my own part, Mr. President, come what may, I intend to vote, speak, and act according to my own sense of duty so long as I hold a seat in this chamber. I have no defense of my Democracy. I have no professions to make of my fidelity. I have no vindication to make of my course. Let it speak for itself. . . . I have no professions to make upon any of these points. I intend to perform my duty in accordance with my own convictions. Neither the frowns of power nor the influence of patronage will change my action, or drive me from my principles. I stand firmly, immovably upon those great principles of self-government and state sovereignty, upon which the

campaign was fought and the election won. . . . I will stand by the Constitution of the United States, with all its compromises, and perform all my obligations under it. I will stand by the American Union as it exists under the Constitution.—*Cited in Sheahan, pp. 318, 319, 340, 347, 351, 352, 353.*

The Pacific Railroad Bill: April 17, 1858; Internal Improvements:

Mr. President,—I have witnessed with deep regret the indications that this measure is to be defeated at the present session of Congress. I had hoped that this Congress would signalize itself by inaugurating the great measure of connecting the Mississipi Valley with the Pacific Ocean by a railroad. I had supposed that the people of the United States had decided the question at the last Presidential election in a manner so emphatic as to leave no doubt that their will was to be carried into effect. I believe that all the presidential candidates at the last election were committed to the measure. . . .

I have sometimes thought that the extreme northern route, known as the Stevens' route, was the best, as furnishing better grass, more timber, more water, more of those elements necessary in constructing, repairing, operating, and maintaining a road, than any other. . . .

But, sir, I am unwilling to lose this great measure merely because of a difference of opinion as to what shall be the pass selected in the Rocky Mountains through which the road shall run. I believe it is a great national measure. I believe it is the greatest practical measure now pending before the country. . . .

I have regretted to see the question of sectional advantages brought into this discussion. If you are to have but one road, fairness and justice would plainly indicate that that one should be located as near the centre as practicable. The Missouri River is as near the centre and the line of this road is as near as it can be made; and if there is but one to be made, the route now indicated, in my opinion, is fair, is just, and ought to be taken. I have heretofore been of the opinion that we ought to have three roads: one in the

centre, one in the extreme south, and one in the extreme north.—*Cited in Sheahan, pp. 372, 374, 375.*

Extract from a campaign speech made at Chicago, 1858; Lincoln had already made his Divided-House doctrine speech:

It is an expression of your devotion to that great principle of self-government (cries of "Hear," "hear") to which my life for many years past has been, and in the whole future will be devoted. (Immense cheering) If there is any one principle dearer and more sacred than all others in free governments, it is that which asserts the exclusive right of a free people to form and adopt their own fundamental law, and to manage and regulate their own internal affairs and domestic institutions. (Applause)—*Cited in Sheahan, p. 406.*

The "Freeport Doctrine" of "unfriendly legislation." The Lincoln-Douglas debate at Freeport, Ill., 1858:

The next question propounded to me by Mr. Lincoln is, "Can the people of a territory in any lawful way, against the wishes of any citizen of the United States, exclude slavery from their limits prior to the formation of a state Constitution." I answer emphatically, as Mr. Lincoln has heard me answer a hundred times from every stump in Illinois, that in my opinion the people of a territory can, by lawful means, exclude slavery from their limits prior to the formation of a state Constitution. Mr. Lincoln knew that I had answered that question over and over again. It matters not what way the Supreme Court may hereafter decide as to the abstract question whether slavery may or may not go into a territory under the Constitution, the people have the lawful means to introduce it or exclude it as they please, for the reason that slavery cannot exist a day or an hour anywhere unless it is supported by local police regulations. Those police regulations can only be established by the local legislature, and if the people are opposed to slavery they will elect representatives to that body who will, by unfriendly legislation, effectually prevent the introduction of it into their midst. If, on the contrary, they are for it, their legis-

lation will favor its extension. Hence, no matter what the decision of the Supreme Court may be on that abstract question, still the right of the people to make a slave territory or a free territory is perfect and complete under the Nebraska Bill. I hope Mr. Lincoln deems my answer satisfactory on that point. . . . The fourth question of Mr. Lincoln is, "Are you in favor of acquiring additional territory in disregard as to how such acquisition may affect the Union on the slavery question?" This question is very ingeniously and cunningly put. . . . I answer that whenever it becomes necessary, in our growth and progress, to acquire more territory, that I am in favor of it, without reference to the question of slavery, and when we have acquired it, I will leave the people free to do as they please, either to make it slave or free territory, as they prefer.—*Cited in Sheahan, pp. 427, 428, 429.*

The Mormons; a speech at Springfield, 1857:

If, upon a full investigation, these representations shall prove true, they will establish the fact that the inhabitants of Utah, as a community, are outlaws and alien enemies, unfit to exercise the right of self-government under the organic act, and unworthy to be admitted into the Union as a state, when their only object in seeking admission is to interpose the sovereignty of the state as an invincible shield to protect them in their treason and crime, debauchery and infamy. (Applause.) . . . Some other and more effectual remedy must be devised and applied. In my opinion the first step should be the absolute and unconditional repeal of the organic act—blotting the territorial government out of existence--upon the ground that they are alien enemies and outlaws, denying their allegiance and defying the authority of the United States. (Immense applause.) The territorial government once abolished, the country would revert to its primitive condition, prior to the act of 1850, "under the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of the United States" and should be placed under the operation of the act of Congress of the 30th of April. 1790, and the various acts supplemental thereto and amendatory thereof, "providing for the punishment of crimes against the United States within any fort, arsenal, dock-yard, magazine, or any other

place or district of country, under the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of the United States."—*Cited in Sheahan, pp. 461, 462.*

Reopening of the African Slave Trade: a letter to John L. Peyton, Stanton, Va., 1859:

Neither have you misapprehended my opinions in respect to the African slave trade. That question seriously disturbed the harmony of the convention which framed the federal Constitution. . .

I stand firmly by this compromise and by all the other compromises of the Constitution, and shall use my best efforts to carry each and all of them into faithful execution, in the sense and with the understanding in which they were originally adopted. In accordance with this compromise, I am irreconcilably opposed to the revival of the African slave trade, in any form and under any circumstances.—*Cited in Sheahan, p. 466.*

Senate Chamber, January 23, 1860, Douglas speaks for a law against invasions of the states, such as that by John Brown, and speaks in these words concerning the results of Lincoln's doctrine, as stated in the first sentence:

"A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this government cannot endure permanently, half slave and half free." . . .

The declaration is that the North must combine as a sectional party and carry on the agitation so fiercely, up to the very borders of the slaveholding states, that the master dare not sleep at night for fear that the robbers, the John Browns, will come and set his house on fire, and murder the women and children before morning. It is to surround the slaveholding states by a cordon of free states, to use the language of the senator; to hem them in, in order that you may smother them out. The Senator avowed, in his speech to-day, their object to be to hem in the slave states, in order that slavery may die out. . . . *Cited in Sheahan, p. 514.*

QUESTIONS.

(1) Position of Douglas regarding Jackson's suspension of the right of *habeas corpus*. (2) Meaning of *habeas corpus*. (3) What the essential point in his argument? (4) Is the argument good? (5) To what result would such a doctrine lead?

(1) What view did Douglas take in regard to the justice of the Mexican War? (2) Compare his position with that of Webster; with that of Calhoun. (3) What reasons does he give for his position? (4) Who was Santa Anna? (5) What treaty is here discussed? (6) What charge does he make against the Federalists and the Whigs?

(1) Was Douglas an expansionist? (2) Bring together all his arguments for or against. (3) What territory did he favor annexing? (4) What conditions did he lay down to be applied to annexed territory? (5) Compare his arguments on this point with Webster's, Clay's and Calhoun's. (6) Are their arguments applicable to-day? (7) Are all of Douglas's arguments consistent with each other? (8) Why did he oppose filibustering? (9) How fast did he want territory? (10) How do you think he would wish to treat the Philippines to-day?

(1) What was Douglas's theory in regard to the control or government of the Territories? (2) Bring together the passages that bear on this subject. (3) What leading principle did he claim was established by the compromise of 1850? (4) How did he propose to apply the principle in 1854? (5) Was Douglas a compromiser? (6) Was he a man of courage? (7) Find out what the Chase Amendment was. (8) How did he propose to amend it? (9) How did Douglas expect to remove the slavery question from American politics? (10) How did he feel towards Chase and Sumner?

(1) What were his views in regard to the rights of foreigners? (2) What did he think about religious proscription? (3) What party did he oppose on account of these principles? (4) How did he stand in regard to admitting Kansas as a state under the Lecompton constitution? (5) Why his position? (6) What article in the constitution did he especially condemn? Why? (7) How did he feel toward President Buchanan on this subject? (8) Did he propose to be dictated to? (9) What feeling had he about the Pacific railroads? (10 What did he think of the effects of Lincoln's Divided House doctrine? (11) What is the "Freeport Doctrine"? (12) Were his views in regard to the power of the Mormons in harmony with his other doctrines? (13) How did he regard the African Slave Trade? (14) Compare his views on slavery with those of Sumner. (15) Compare them with Clay's; with Calhoun's.

WILLIAM H. SEWARD

Born in New Jersey, 1801. Graduate of Union College. Settled at Auburn, N. Y. Member of the New York legislature, 1830-1832. Governor of New York, 1838-1842. Senator, 1851-1861. Secretary of state, 1861-1869. "Higher Law" doctrine speech, 1850. "Irrepressible Conflict" speech, 1858. Candidate for nomination for President, 1856, 1860. Trip around the world, 1870-1871. Died, 1872.

CHAPTER VIII

WILLIAM H. SEWARD

PERHAPS William H. Seward was the greatest among the political opponents of slavery. He ranks with Chase and Douglas. In general, he agreed with the former, and during most of his career he was a strenuous opponent of the latter.

Seward was born in New Jersey, and educated in its academies and at Union College, New York. He graduated at the latter in 1821, ranking as one of its most distinguished scholars. He had been ready to enter the Junior class when he was only fifteen, but on account of his extreme youth he was prevailed upon to enter the Sophomore. He withdrew to teach when nineteen, hence did not graduate till he had reached his twenty-first year.

He was married in 1824, and settled down at Auburn, where he continued to live till his death.

Election of mayors of cities by the people. One of the earliest speeches of Seward, April 22, 1831, was in favor of this democratic principle. In part, he said:

> What is the state of the question before the Senate? The provision required by the city of New York is, that the mayor of that city shall be elected by the people. . . .
>
> It is admitted that the office of mayor is one of local interests, duties and responsibilities, and that it is, in

the abstract, right and proper that the mayor should be elected by the people in that city. Why, then, should not this provision, conceded to be abstractly right and proper, be adopted? Is it to be rejected on the ground of distrust of the people? No such distrust is avowed, and I am therefore bound to believe none is indulged. . . .

Again, sir, the tendency of all our principles of government is to democracy; the new Constitution took the appointment from the council of appointment, and conferred it upon the immediate representatives of the people. There is but one more change before you reach absolute democracy; that is the one now proposed, and conceded to be proper. Are gentlemen afraid that the people, once invested with this power, will come back again and sue us to relieve them from its responsibilities? Such an instance would be anomalous in the history of government.—*Seward, Works, Vol. I, pp. 10, 11, 12.*

January 10, 1834, he opposed the passage by the legislature of New York of a resolution approving the removal of the deposits from the National Bank, by Jackson, in this language:

The usurpation of the secretary's powers is not the most alarming feature in this unprecedented transaction. It is the defiance of the supervisory power of Congress uttered by the President of the United States. Yes, sir, in this very document, under the President's own hand, we are told that the power of the secretary over these deposits is unqualified, and as the secretary is in all things responsible to the executive, it follows that the power of the President over them is also unqualified. . . .

The first of these offences is, that two years ago, in a debate similar to this, I defended the principles of anti-masonry in this house. Now, sir, with all my solicitude to secure the unreserved esteem of my honorable friend, the act of which he complains is precisely that one for which, of all others, I cannot admit his censure to be just. Sir, my honorable friend will recollect that I was then, as I am now, an anti-mason. I was sent here by anti-masons. I am not, as the gentle-

man well knows, the man to profess principles in one place I am afraid or ashamed to avow in another. I am not the man, when sent here because I am known to entertain political principles approved by my constituents, to abandon those principles for any which shall be more popular in this place. Under such circumstances, when "the blessed spirit" of anti-masonry was traduced in the Senate, I could not sit by in silence. Nor should I now. . . .

. . . It is my principle that it is the business of the legislature to confine themselves within the sphere of duties prescribed by the Constitution. It is his that the legislature may safely transcend that sphere to assume the duties and responsibilities of Congress. It is my principle that it is the duty of the legislature to resist usurpation of legislative powers by the executive. It is his that it is safer to trust to executive discretion than to legislative wisdom. It is mine that the governing and sole motive in all legislation ought to be the security of the government and the good of the people. It is his that the powers of government ought to be so wielded as to subserve the ambition of him who happens to be the favorite of the predominant party of the day.—*Works, Vol. I., pp. 24, 33-34, 35.*

In his annual message of 1839 we find this language:

All institutions of government are imperfect, and subject to the law of improvement. Despotism denies this. It holds that institutions are complete, and that laws are wise, because they are old. It maintains that error is sanctified by prescription, and compels the submission which renders it invulnerable. A different principle prevails in America. Antiquity has a shrine and worship in all lands but this. We have learned, that as the intelligence of people increases, the power of the government may safely be abridged; that error must be separated from our institutions before it becomes inseparable; and that the best laws, unless modified according to the ever-varying conditions of society, operate injuriously or fall into disuse. . . .

Every other vice of government is more endurable than delay in the administration of justice. Yet this is the vice that most easily besets republican institutions. . . .

The public service is not to be regarded as a profession. The healthful action of our whole system depends upon the responsibility and the frequent change of agents. He is as much a pensioner who receives a compensation exceeding the value of his services, as one who receives allowance from the public treasury. Of pensioners, this country ought to know only those whose reward is a stinted requittal for perils, privations, and sufferings, in the achievement and defense of our liberties. . . . Conscientiously holding the principle of universal suffrage, and indulging no apprehension of evil from its practical operation, if fairly carried out, with proper safeguards against its abuse, I am yet free to confess my fears, that it will prove a fatal franchise, unless such safeguards be applied. . . .

Thirteen years' experience has proved the inadequacy of all our thoroughfares for the transportation of persons and property between the frontier and tide-waters. It is submitted whether sound policy does not require that the enlargement of the Erie canal be completed as speedily as may be consistent with the public convenience. This generation may as well participate in its manifold advantages as resign them.—*Works, Vol II, pp. 190, 191, 193, 194, 197, 199.*

We find this discussion in his message as governor of New York, 1840:

. . . The advantages of education ought to be secured to many, especially in our large cities, whom orphanage, the depravity of parents, or other forms of accident or misfortune seem to have doomed to hopeless poverty and ignorance. Their intellects are as susceptible of expansion, of improvement, or refinement, of elevation, and of direction, as those minds which, through the favor of Providence are permitted to develop themselves under the influence of better fortunes; they inherit the common lot to struggle against temptations, necessities and vices; they are to assume the same domestic, social and political relations; and they are born to the same ultimate destiny. . . . Since we have opened our country and all its fullness to the oppressed of every nation, we should evince wisdom equal to such generosity by qualifying their children for the high responsibilities of citizenship. . . .

A requisition was made upon me in July last, by the executive of Virginia, for the delivery of three persons as fugitives from justice, charged with having feloniously stolen a negro slave in that state. I declined to comply with the requisition, upon the grounds that the right to demand, and the reciprocal obligation to surrender, fugitives from justice, between sovereign and independent nations, as defined by the law of nations, included only those cases in which the acts constituting the offence charged were recognized as crimes by the universal laws of all civilized countries; that the object of the provision contained in the constitution of the United States, authorizing the demand and surrender of fugitives charged with treason, felony, or other crime, was to recognize and establish this principle of the law of nations in the mutual relations of the states as independent, equal and sovereign communities; that the acts charged upon the persons demanded, were not recognized as criminal by the laws of this state, or by the universal law of all civilized countries; and that consequently the case did not fall within the provision of the constitution of the United States.--*Works, Vol. II, pp. 215, 216, 221-222.*

From message of 1842:

A governmental management of railroads would be an experiment here, and it is supposed to have been unsuccessful elsewhere; although it is not obvious why, with diligence, skill, and experience, equal to what are employed in managing the canals, a system of supervision of railroads could not be adopted. There is much force in the argument, that it would increase central influence; yet, it is not clear that the influence of corporations would be more harmless, and there is much reason to believe that the more speedy diffusion of intelligence will neutralize such influence in either form. . . . —*Works, Vol. II, p. 317.*

Extracts from a speech at a Whig mass meeting, in Yates county, New York, October 29, 1844:

Universal political equality among all the subjects of the government was proclaimed in the very outset of the Revolution as an element of this democracy.

The principle was asserted, but it was only partially established. . . . Slavery is the bane of our social condition. It divides the empire into two portions, between whom it perpetually prevents any harmony of fiscal economy. It arrays the south against the north. It exposes us to danger from abroad, and has once brought the country to the verge of disunion. All these evils happen because slavery is an aristocratic institution compared with our democracy. . . . The conscience of the people is aroused. The laws of political economy, combining with the inevitable tendencies of population, are hastening emancipation, and all the labors of statesmen and politicians to prevent it are ineffectual. . . . Heretofore they told us that we had nothing to do with slavery; that it was no concern of ours. But now the slaveholder has brought it home to us. It is our concern now, God be praised! It is a national concern. The annexation of Texas to enlarge and fortify the slave trade, is forsooth "a great democratic measure." Out upon such democracy! . . . True democracy is equality and liberty. The democracy of the Texas party is aristocracy for the white race, and bondage for the black. . . .—*Works, Vol. III, pp. 269, 270, 271, 272.*

From a speech at Cleveland, O., October 26, 1848:

The first principle of our duty as Americans is to preserve the integrity of the Union. . . .

The second principle of American citizenship is, that our democratic system must be preserved and perfected. That system is founded in the natural equality of all men—not alone all American men, nor alone all white men, but all men of every country, clime and complexion, are equal—not made equal by human laws, but born equal. . . .

A third principle of American citizenship is, that knowledge ought to be diffused, as well for the safety of the state, as to promote the happiness of society.

A fourth principle is, that our national resources, physical, moral, and intellectual, ought to be developed and applied to increase the public wealth, and enhance the convenience and comfort of the people.

A fifth principle is, that peace and moderation are indispensable to the preservation of republican institutions.

A sixth principle is, that slavery must be abolished.

* * *

"What, then!" you say, "can nothing be done for freedom because the public conscience is inert?" Yes, much can be done—everything can be done. Slavery can be limited to its present bounds, it can be ameliorated, it can be and must be abolished, and you and I can and must do it. . . .

Wherein do the strength and security of slavery lie? You answer that they lie in the Constitution of the United States, and the constitution and laws of all slaveholding states. Not at all. They lie in the erroneous sentiment of the American people. Constitutions and laws can no more rise above the virtue of the people than the limpid stream can climb above its native spring. Inculcate then, the love of freedom and the eternal rights of man, under the paternal roof; see to it that they are taught in the schools and in the churches; reform your own code—extend a cordial welcome to the fugitive who lays his weary limbs at your door, and defend him as you would your paternal gods.—*Works, Vol. III, pp. 293, 301.*

From a private letter to H. C. W., of New York, 1840:

. . . You remark that, "even to a partial observer, it cannot be disguised, that we, as a party, have been practicing efforts to secure the votes of the Irish," and your subsequent explanations show that I am supposed to be concerned in these "practices." . . .

After what I have said you will naturally expect that I shall differ from you, in regard to the opinions you give concerning this class of adopted citizens. I do not agree, "that the lower order of Irish are incapable of being persuaded by reason." I do not think that "they have been placed by the Divine Omnipotent in the lowest scale of creation." . . .

I think that the Irish population to whom you allude, are useful, well-meaning, and as a mass, inoffensive, and religiously-disposed citizens. . . .

. . . I think them more generous, liberal and disinterested, than most other classes of the community, reposing more than others upon the consolation of their religion, and less disposed to force its tenets upon others. . . .

If this confession of faith seems strange to you, you will permit me to explain, that I could not believe otherwise, without doing dishonor to a mother, eminent for many virtues, and to the memories of humble ancestors, whose names will not be saved from obscurity by the record of any extraordinary vices. . . .

. . . Why should an American hate foreigners? It is to hate such as his forefathers were. Why should a foreigner be taught to hate Americans? It is to hate what he is most anxious his children shall become. For myself, so far from hating any of my fellow-citizens, I should shrink from myself, if I did not recognize them all as worthy of my constant solicitude to promote their welfare, and entitled of right, by the constitution and laws, and by the higher laws of God himself, to equal rights, equal privileges, and equal political favor, as citizens of the state, with myself. . . . *Works, Vol. III, pp. 378, 379, 380.*

From a letter to W. B. S., New York, 1840:

I have not time to pursue this subject as I wish. But I desire to be distinctly understood, that while I dictate to no one, and shall cheerfully yield my place to others whose principles may suit the whig party better, I disavow, and altogether reject the counsel of proscription of immigrants. This right hand drops off before I do one act with the whig or any other party in opposition to any portion of my fellow-citizens, on the ground of the difference of their nativity or of their religion. No pretence of policy, no sense of injury, shall induce me to join, aid or abet such miserable efforts.—*Works, Vol. III, p. 388.*

To the Chautauqua convention, 1846:

We have reached a new stage in our national career. It is that of territorial aggrandizement. Extended jurisdiction is an element of national strength, if the moral condition of the people be sound; of national weakness, if that condition be unsound. . . . I

want no war. I want no enlargement of territory sooner than it would come if we were contented with "a masterly inactivity." I abhor war, as I detest slavery. I would not give one human life for all the continent that remains to be annexed. But I cannot exclude the conviction, that the popular passion for territorial aggrandizement is irresistible. Prudence, justice, cowardice, may check it for a season, but it will gain strength by its subjugation. . . . Our population is destined to roll its resistless waves to the icy barriers of the north, and to encounter oriental civilization on the shores of the Pacific. . . . It behooves us then, to qualify ourselves for our mission. We must dare our destiny. We can do this, and can only do it by early measures which shall effect the abolition of slavery, without precipitancy, without oppression, without injustice to slaveholders, without civil war, with the consent of mankind and the approbation of Heaven. . . . —*Works, Vol. III, pp. 408, 409.*

From Seward's great and famous speech of March 11, 1850, in the senate of the United States:

But it is insisted that the admission of California shall be attended by a COMPROMISE of questions which have arisen out of SLAVERY!

I AM OPPOSED TO ANY SUCH COMPROMISE, IN ANY AND ALL THE FORMS IN WHICH IT HAS BEEN PROPOSED; because, while admitting the purity and the patriotism of all from whom it is my misfortune to differ, I think all legislative compromises, which are not absolutely necessary, radically wrong and essentially vicious. They involve the surrender of the exercise of judgment and conscience on distinct and separate questions, . . . We deem the principle of the law for the recapture of fugitives, as thus expounded, therefore, unjust, unconstitutional, and immoral; and thus, while patriotism withholds its approbation, the consciences of our people condemn it.

You will say that these convictions of ours are disloyal. Grant it for the sake of argument. They are nevertheless, honest; and the law is to be executed among us, not among you; not by us, but by the federal

authority. . . . It is true, indeed, that the national domain is ours. It is true it was acquired by the valor and with the wealth of the whole nation. But we hold, nevertheless, no arbitrary power over it. We hold no arbitrary authority over anything, whether acquired lawfully or seized by usurpation. The Constitution regulates our stewardship; the Constitution devotes the domain to union, to justice, to defence, to welfare and to liberty.

But there is a higher law than the Constitution, which regulates our authority over the domain and devotes it to the same noble purposes. . . . I feel assured that slavery must give way, and will give way, to the salutary instructions of economy, and to the ripening influences of humanity; that emancipation is inevitable and is near; that it may be hastened or hindered; and that whether it shall be peaceful or violent, depends upon the question whether it be hastened or hindered; that all measures which fortify slavery or extend it, tend to the consummation of violence; all that check its extension and abate its strength, tend to its peaceful extirpation. . . . —*Works, Vol. I, pp. 60, 65, 74, 87.*

Words of "welcome to Kossuth," in the senate, December 12, 1851, and "Freedom in Europe," March 9, 1852:

Again, sir, you may reject Kossuth; you may, if you please, propitiate despotic favor by trampling the exiles of all Europe under your feet. But what will you have gained? This republic is, and forever must be, a living offence to Russia and to Austria, and to despotic powers everywhere. You will never, by whatever humiliations, gain one friend or secure one ally in Europe or America that wears a crown. It is clear that the days of despotism are numbered. We do not know whether its end is to come this year, or next year, or the year after; in this quarter of a century, or in this half of a century. But there is to come sooner or later, a struggle between the representative and the arbitrary systems of government. . . . It has already come to this—that whenever in any country an advocate of freedom, by the changes of fortune, is

driven into exile, he hastens to seek an asylum here; that whenever a hero falls in the cause of freedom on any of her battle-fields, his eyes involuntarily turn toward us, and he commits that cause with a confiding trust to our sympathy and our care. Never, sir, as we value the security of our own freedom, or the welfare and happiness of mankind, or the favor of heaven, that has enabled us to protect both, let that exile be inhospitably repulsed. Never let the prayer of that dying hero fall on ears unused to hear, or spend itself upon hearts that refuse to be moved. — *Works, Vol. I, pp. 184, 221.*

Speech in the Senate, January 26, 1853, on "Continental Rights and Relations:"

While I do not desire the immediate or early annexation of Cuba, nor see how I could vote for it at all until slavery shall have ceased to counteract the workings of nature in that beautiful island, nor even then, unless it could come into the Union without injustice to Spain, without aggressive war, and without producing internal dissensions among ourselves, I nevertheless yield up my full assent to the convictions expressed by John Quincy Adams, that this nation can never safely allow the island of Cuba to pass under the dominion of any power that is already, or can become a formidable rival or enemy. . . . And I shall vote for reaffirming and maintaining the principles of John Quincy Adams, as defined in the Monroe doctrine, and in his policy in regard to Cuba, at all times, and under all circumstances whatsoever. . . . The senator tells us that the question of the acquisition of Cuba may be upon us to-morrow, and may not be upon us for twenty-five years. That is to say, it stands now, so far as we can see, where it has stood for twenty-five years past. But he advises us to be ready. That is just what I propose to do. And the way to keep ready is to keep cool.—*Works, Vol. III, pp. 610, 611, 616.*

Oration, September 14, 1853, on "The Destiny of America:"

If the future which you seek consists in this: that these thirty-one states shall continue to exist for a period as long as human foresight is allowed to antici-

pate after coming events; that they shall be all the while free; that they shall remain distinct and independent in domestic economy, and nevertheless be only one in commerce and foreign affairs; that there shall arise from among them and within their common domain even more than thirty-one other equal states alike free, independent, and united; that the borders of the federal republic, so peculiarly constituted, shall be extended so that it shall greet the sun when he touches the tropic, and when he sends his glancing rays toward the polar circle, and shall include even distant islands in either ocean; that our population now counted by tens of millions shall ultimately be reckoned by hundreds of millions; that our wealth shall increase a thousand fold, and our commercial connections shall be multiplied and our political influence be enhanced in proportion with this wide development, and that mankind shall come to recognize in us a successor of the few great states which have alternately borne commanding sway in the world—if this, and only this, is desired, then I am free to say that if, as you will readily promise, our public and private virtues shall be preserved, nothing seems to me more certain than the attainment of this future, so surpassingly comprehensive and magnificent.

Indeed, such a future seems to be only a natural consequence of what has already been secured. Why, then, shall it not be attained? Is not the field as free for the expansion indicated as it was for that which has occurred? . . .

Certainly no one expects the nations of Asia to be awakened by any other influences than our own from the lethargy into which they sunk nearly three thousand years ago, under the spells of superstition and caste. If they could be roused and invigorated now, would they spare their European oppressors and smite their American benefactors? . . .

I do not seek to disguise from myself, nor from you, the existence of a growing passion for territorial aggrandizement, which often exhibits a gross disregard of justice and humanity. . . . *Works, Vol. IV, pp. 122, 125, 137.*

On "The Advent of the Republican Party," October 12, 1855, at Albany, N. Y.:

So long as the republican party shall be true and faithful to the constitution, the Union and the rights of men, I shall serve it with the reservation of that personal independence which is my birthright, but, at the same time, with the zeal and devotion that patriotism allows and enjoins. I do not know, and personally I do not greatly care, that it shall work out its great ends this year, or the next, or in my lifetime; because I know that those ends are ultimately sure, and that time and trial are the elements which make all great reformations sure and lasting. I have not thus far lived for personal ends or temporary fame, and I shall not begin so late to live or labor for them. I have hoped that I might leave my country somewhat worthier of a lofty destiny, and the rights of human nature somewhat safer. A reasonable ambition must always be satisfied with sincere and practical endeavors. If, among those who shall come after us, there shall be any curious inquirer who shall fall upon a name so obscure as mine, he shall be obliged to confess that, however unsuccessfully I labored for generous ends, yet that I nevertheless was ever faithful, ever hopeful.—*Works, Vol. IV, p. 240.*

"The Contest and the Crisis," Buffalo, October 19, 1855:

The opposition tell us, that if congress could prohibit slavery in territories, then they might establish it there; and hence they argue against the power to prohibit. No! Congress can establish slavery nowhere. Slavery was never established rightfully anywhere. Nor was it ever established by law. It is in violation of every line of the Declaration of Independence, and of the whole summary of personal rights contained in the Constitution. It is derogatory from the absolute rights of human nature, and no human power can subvert those rights. . . . The apologists of slavery, thus met, change front suddenly, and ask us whether it is safe to brave these menaces of disunion. I answer —Yes, yes! . . . Three millions of slaves are a hostile force constantly in their presence, in their very

midst. The servile war is almost the most fearful form of war. The world without sympathizes with the servile enemy. Against that war, the American Union is the only defense of the slaveholders—their only protection. If ever they shall, in a season of madness, secede from that Union and provoke that war, they will—soon come back again.—*Works, Vol. IV, pp. 247, 248.*

"The Irrepressible Conflict" speech, Rochester, October 25, 1858:

Russia yet maintains slavery, and is a despotism.

Most of the other European states have abolished slavery, and adopted the system of free labor. . . . The two systems are at once perceived to be incongruous. But they are more than incongruous—they are incompatible. They never have permanently existed together in one country, and they never can. . . .

Hitherto, the two systems have existed in different states, but side by side within the American Union. This has happened because the Union is a confederacy of states. But in another aspect the United States constitute only one nation. Increase of population, which is filling the states out to their very borders, together with a new and extended net-work of railroads and other avenues, and an internal commerce which daily becomes more intimate, is rapidly bringing the states into a higher and more perfect social unity or consolidation. Thus, these antagonistic systems are continually coming into closer contact, and collision results.

Shall I tell you what this collision means? They who think that it is accidental, unnecessary, the work of interested or fanatical agitators, and therefore ephemeral, mistake the case altogether. It is an irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces and it means that the United States must and will, sooner or later, become either entirely a slaveholding nation, or entirely a free labor nation. Either the cotton and rice fields of South Carolina and the sugar plantations of Louisiana will ultimately be tilled by free labor, and Charleston and New Orleans become marts for legitimate merchandise alone, or else the rye-fields and wheat-fields of Massachusetts and New York must again

be surrendered by their farmers to slave culture and to the production of slaves, and Boston and New York become once more markets for trade in the bodies and souls of men. It is the failure to apprehend this great truth that induces so many unsuccessful attempts at final compromise between the slave and free states, and it is the existence of this great fact that renders all such pretended compromises, when made, vain and ephemeral. . . .

. . . Having seen the society around me universally engaged in agriculture, manufacture and trade, which were innocent and beneficent, I shall never be a denizen of a state where men and women are reared as cattle, and bought and sold as merchandise. When that evil day shall come, and all further effort at resistance shall be impossible, then, if there shall be no better hope for redemption than I can now foresee, I shall say with Franklin, while looking abroad over the whole earth for a new and more congenial home, "Where liberty dwells, there is my country."

You will tell me that these fears are extravagant and chimerical. I answer, they are so; but they are so only because the designs of the slaveholders must and can be defeated. . . . *Works, Vol. IV, pp. 291, 292, 295.*

From a speech at Detroit, September 4, 1860:

My humble advice, then, fellow citizens, is, that we return and reestablish the original policy of the nation, and henceforth hold, as we did in the beginning, that slavery is and must be only a purely local, temporary and exceptional institution, confined within the slave states where it already exists, while freedom is the general, normal, enduring and permanent condition of society within the jurisdiction, and under the authority of the constitution of the United States.—*Works, Vol. IV, p. 314.*

From a speech at St. Paul, September 18, 1860:

I have been asked by many of you what I think of Minnesota. I will not enlarge further than to say, that Minnesota must be either a great state or a mean

one, just as her people shall have wisdom and virtue to decide. That some great states are to be built up in the Mississippi Valley, I know. You will not longer hereafter hear of the "Old Dominion" state. Dominion has been passing away from Virginia long ago. Pennsylvania is no longer the "Keystone" of the American Union, for the arch has been extended from the Atlantic Coast to the Pacific Ocean, and the center of the arch is moved westward also; a new keystone is to be inserted in that arch. New York will cease to be the "Empire State," and a new Empire State will grow up in a northern latitude, where the lands are rich, and where the people who cultivate them are all free and all equal; where the wealth of the continent is made, not where it is exchanged. That state which shall be truest to the great fundamental principle of the government, the principle of equality, that state which shall be most faithful, most vigorous in developing and perfecting society on this principle, will be at once the New Dominion State, the new Keystone State, the new Empire State. . . . *Works, Vol. IV, p. 347.*

Extracts from his speech at Chicago, October 3, 1860:

When slavery became identical in the public mind with the Union, how natural it was, even for patriotic men, to approve of, or to at least excuse and tolerate slavery. How odious did it become for men to be free-soldiers, and to be regarded as abolitionists, when to be an abolitionist was, in the estimation of mankind, to be a traitor to one's country, and to such a country as this is. How natural was it then to believe that slavery after all might not be so very bad, and to believe that it might be necessary and might be right at some times, or on some occasions, which times and occasions were always a good ways off from themselves; especially how natural was it, when the whole Christian church, with all its sects, bent itself to the support of the Union, mistaking the claim of slavery for the cause of the Union. . . .

People of Illinois! People of the great west! You are all youthful, vigorous, generous. Your states are youthful, vigorous, and virtuous. The destinies of our country, the hopes of mankind, the hopes of lov-

manity rest upon you. Ascend, I pray, I conjure you, to the dignity of that high responsibility! Thus acting, you will have peace and harmony and happiness in your future years. The world, looking on, will applaud you, and future generations in all ages and in all regions will rise up and call you blessed.--*Works, Vol. IV. pp. 357, 367.*

From Seward's second speech on the Kansas-Nebraska bill, May 25, 1854, and other later speeches on the same subject:

All the immigrants, under this bill as the house of representatives overruling you have ordered, will be good, loyal, liberty-loving, slavery-fearing citizens. Come on, then, gentlemen of the slave states. Since there is no escaping your challenge, I accept it in behalf of the cause of freedom. We will engage in competition for the virgin soil of Kansas, and God give the victory to the side which is stronger in numbers as it is in right. . . . In doing this, I do no more than those who believe the slave power is rightest, wisest, and best, are doing, and will continue to do, with my free consent, to establish its complete supremacy. If they shall succeed, I still shall be, as I have been, a loyal citizen. If we succeed, I know they will be loyal also, because it will be safest, wisest, and best, for them to be so. The question is one, not of a day, or of a year, but of many years, and for aught I know, many generations. Like all other great political questions, it will be attended sometimes by excitement, sometimes by passion, and sometimes, perhaps, even by faction; but it is sure to be settled in a constitutional way, without any violent shock to society, or to any of its great interests. . . .

My position concerning legislative compromises is this, namely: personal, partisan, temporary and subordinate questions, may lawfully be compromised; but principles can never be justly or wisely made the subjects of compromise. By principles I mean the elements in public questions, of moral rights, political justice, and high national expediency. . . There is no peace in this world for compromisers; there is no peace for those who practice evasion; there is no peace

in a republican land for any statesmen but those who act directly, and boldly abide the popular judgment whenever it may be fairly and clearly and fully ascertained, without attempting to falsify the issue submitted, or to corrupt the tribunal. . —*Works, Vol. IV, pp. 471, 476-77, 517, 611-12.*

Taken from Seward's Diary and Notes on the War:

April 1, 1862.—Earl Russell, in the house of Lords, expressed the belief that this country is large enough for two independent nations, and the hope that this government will assent to a peaceful separation from the insurrectionary States. A very brief sojourn among us, with an observation of our mountains, rivers, and coasts, and some study of our social condition and habits, would be sufficient to satisfy him, on the contrary, that the country is not too large for one such people as this, and that it is, and must always be, too mall for two distinct nations, until the people shall have become so demoralized by faction that they are ready to enter the course which leads through continued subdivision to continued anarchy. All the British speculations assume that the political elements which have been brought into antagonism here are equal in vigor and endurance. Nothing, however, is more certain than that freedom and slavery are very unequal in these qualities, and that when these diverse elements are eliminated, the former from the cause of sedition, and the latter from the cause of the government, then the government must prevail, sustained as it is by the co-operating sentiments of loyalty, of national pride, interest, ambition, and the permanent love of peace.—*Works, Vol. V, p. 51.*

Extract from a speech to his neighbors, October 3, 1868, entitled "The Situation and the Duty:"

No one state in the Union, nor any fraction of a state, was, by any action or word of mine, driven or allowed to separate itself from the Union. On the contrary, every act or word that I could lawfully perform or speak to prevent that wild treason or madness

was spoken with all the decision, and yet with all the moderation, that such counsels required. When that frightful rebellion ceased, no one state of the Union, or fraction of a state, was, by any action or word of mine, repelled from returning to his allegiance. On the contrary, every act or word of mine that was useful, or that promised to be useful, in bringing those revolutionary states back to reinforce and reinvigorate the Union which they had so rashly attempted to destroy, was seasonably performed and spoken. — *Works, Vol. V, p. 557.*

In 1861 Mr. Seward was accused of lacking in patriotism on account of a speech he made in the senate. He wrote the following letter concerning the charge. The letter explains itself:

WASHINGTON, February 23, 1861.

MY DEAR SIR: The American people in our day have two great interests. One, the ascendancy of freedom over slavery; the other, the integrity of the Union! The slavery interest has derived its whole political power from bringing the latter object into antagonism with the former. Twelve years ago freedom was in danger and the Union was not. I spoke then so singly for freedom that short-sighted men inferred that I was disloyal to the Union. I endured the reproach without complaining, and now I have my vindication. To-day, practically, freedom is not in danger, and Union is. With the loss of Union, all would be lost. With the attempt to maintain Union by civil war wantonly brought on there would be danger of reaction against the administration charged with the preservation of both freedom and the Union. Now, therefore, I speak singly for Union, striving, if possible, to save it peaceably; if not possible, then to cast the responsibility upon the party of slavery. For this singleness of speech I am now suspected of infidelity to freedom. In this case, as in the other, I refer myself not to the men of any time, but to the judgment of history. I thank you, my dear Sir, for having anticipated what I think history will pronounce.

But do not publish or show this letter. Leave me to

be misunderstood. I am not impatient. I write to to you only because I would not be nor seem to be ungrateful. Faithfully your friend,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

—*Works, Vol. V, pp. 613–614.*

QUESTIONS

(1) What change in the manner of selecting mayors of cities did Seward advocate? (2) What reason did he give? (3) Was he right? (4) Was Seward a democrat or an aristocrat? (5) Bring together as many proofs as you can find in these extracts to sustain your position. (6) Was he a hopeful man? (7) Give all the proofs you can find for your opinion.

(1) How did Seward regard secret societies? (2) What views did he hold regarding the national bank? (3) What view did he take of Jackson's course in causing the removal of the "Deposits"? (4) Was he a friend of change—of progress? (5) All the proofs you can find. (6) What different tendency did he find in democratic and monarchic governments? (7) Did he believe in universal suffrage? (8) Was he a friend to a system of internal improvements? (9) How did he view the state's duty towards education? (10) Who especially should the state educate?

(1) What view did Seward take in regard to his duty as governor; to deliver men to the state of Virginia who had aided negroes in escaping? (2) Was he right? (3) Did he believe the people of the North were interested in southern slavery? (4) Find as many passages to illustrate as you can. (5) What were the great duties of true American citizens? (6) What constituted the strength of slavery in his mind? (7) Did he sympathize with opposition to foreigners? (8) Was he favorable to, or opposed to, the Know-Nothings? (9) How did he and Douglas agree on this question? (10) Summarize his arguments on this question.

(1) Was he favorable to territorial expansion? (2) How did he look on the Cuban question? (3) Compare his views with those of Douglas. (4) State his views in regard to compromise. (5) Compare his views with the views of Webster. (6) What two celebrated phrases can you find in these extracts? (7) What did he mean by each? (8) How did Lincoln express the same thought as is found in one of them? (9) Was he brave in expressing opinions? (10) Was he a radical or a conservative? (11) Why was he so friendly to Kossuth? (12) Who was Kossuth?

(1) What destiny did he see for the United States? (2) Under what conditions? (3) Outline the ideas he set forth in his campaign speeches of 1860. (4) Did he believe the nation large enough to make two of? (5)

Why his answer? (6) Which principle, slavery or freedom, did he hold was bound to triumph? (7) Give his arguments. (8) What view did he take in regard to "reconstruction," judged by his speech of 1868? (9) Object of his so-called compromise speech of 1860. (10) Write a "life" of Seward.

SALMON PORTLAND CHASE

Born in New Hampshire, 1808. Graduate of Dartmouth. Taught in Washington, 1826-1829. Settled in Cincinnati, 1830. Senator, 1849-1855. Candidate for nomination for President, 1856, 1860. Governor of Ohio, 1855-1859. Secretary of the treasury, 1861-1864. Chief Justice, 1864-1873. Suggested for President, 1868, 1872. Leader of the anti-slavery party in Ohio, 1842-1861. Died, 1873.

CHAPTER IX

SALMON PORTLAND CHASE

CHASE had been considered the chief rival of Seward for leadership in the new Republican party to the time of Lincoln's nomination for president in 1860. He was a man of large mould both in mind and body. Of New England ancestry he early came to Ohio, and became identified with the West. His education was broad and general rather than deep. In some respects it was perhaps superficial, if we may judge from his own statements in regard to his college course, and his previous preparation. In the main his preparation was received from private instructors. His college course was taken partly at Cincinnati, and finished at Dartmouth. After his graduation, at the age of twenty, he went to Washington and became a tutor in private families, and especially in that of Mr. Wirt. He pursued his law studies at the same time, and after admission to the bar he returned to Ohio, and located at Cincinnati, where he soon became one of its recognized leaders.

Chase was not a party man in the usual sense of the term; at least he was always very independent, and either voted independently, or changed his party ties frequently. He began life as a Whig; later he became an Independent Democrat; a Liberty party man; a Free

Soiler; a Republican; and ended his life as a Democrat, if he could be said to have any party ties after he became Chief Justice.

He was accused of inordinate ambition to become president. That he would have accepted the place is undoubted; however, if his private letters are to be the standard from which we may judge his aspirations, the charge is not sustained.

Chase was a man of deep convictions, profound views, and solid judgment rather than of brilliant parts. He was not as quick as Douglas; not as keen a politician as Seward; and had not the self-restraint and self-command of Lincoln.

The following quotations are made in the hope that the student may work out from them something of an independent judgment in regard to the character and work of one of our great statesmen.

The following brief extracts give us something of an insight into the early life of Chase, and the forces which were tending to form his character.

One day I and two or three more were rolling nine pins. There was an alley on our premises. My father came and said: 'Salmon, come and go with me to the field.' I lingered, hating to leave the game. 'Won't you come and help your father?' Only a look with that. All my reluctance vanished, and I went with a right good will. He ruled by kind words and kind looks. . . .

For several months—at least weeks—before going, I knew that my uncle had proposed to take me and that I was to go to him in Ohio. I tried to find out where I was going and got some queer information. "The Ohio," as the country was then called, was a great way off—it was very fertile—cucumbers grew on trees—

there were wonderful springs whose waters were like New England rum—deer and wolves were plenty—people few. A copy of Morse's Gazetteer gave me somewhat better but still scanty information. . . .

I entered college at Cincinnati, Ohio, as a freshman, but soon conceived the idea, that, by extra study, I could be advanced to the next higher class, and, having obtained the consent of Mr. Sparrow, then in college as Junior or Senior, to hear my lessons, began to read up with that view. It was not very difficult to accomplish the object; for the requirements of scholarship were by no means exacting. In a short time, I offered myself to be examined for advanced standing, and was advanced to be sophomore. . . .

"Salmon" said he, "I once obtained an office for a nephew of mine, and he was ruined by it. I then determined never to ask one for another. I will give you fifty cents to buy a spade with, but I will not help to get you a clerkship. . . .

Mr. Clay gave a party this evening, and I attended, as I had neglected several previous evenings. When I arrived I found that the company had not yet assembled, and, after paying my respects to Mr. and Mrs. Clay, I took my station near the door to observe the various manners of the entering visitants. I soon tired of this employment and went into the next room and looked at the clock and the company alternately until half an hour had elapsed, when I took my leave, glad to escape from the scene of ceremonious frivolity. . . .

Dec. 14, 1830. Attended the Court, and, with several others, was examined for admission to the bar. One was rejected, two were deferred; three, of whom I was one, were admitted. So I am now an attorney-at-law. I have a profession. Let me not dishonor it. . .

After breakfast, we went to the hotel, where I obtained a room much larger than I needed, indeed, for I am but six feet by one or two, and the chamber was at least ten by six [At Cincinnati, his future home].—*Cited in Warden's Life of Chase, pp. 25, 65, 93, 121, 153, 175, 187.*

In 1845 he writes the following in his diary:

Have not attended church to-day, chiefly because of inconvenience of getting to town, having no place there

for my horses; but partly, also, *because I feel doubtful as to my duty arising from the relation of the church to slavery. On one side, I cannot doubt that it is wrong for the church to maintain an indifferent if not an hostile attitude to the cause of the enslaved; on the other, I feel quite sure that other members of the church, who do not feel as I do in reference to the slaves, are far more zealous in other good works, and live much nearer to Christ. I am anxious to see the path of duty in reference to the subject of church connection more clearly than I do.— Warden, p. —*

In 1841, when a member of the city council, he took a stand which he records in the following words in his diary:

On Wednesday evening, at the Council, I openly declared my resolution to vote for no more licenses to sell intoxicating drinks, whether to taverns or other houses, and I took some pains to prevent the grant of a license to a new house proposed to be established on Main Street, in which I succeeded. I don't know what the effect may be on me personally, but I believe that I have done right. . . .

The following extracts are made from three political addresses prepared by Chase during the years 1843, 1844, and 1845:

I have only to say, I never proposed the resolution; I never would propose or vote for such a resolution. I hold no doctrine of mental reservation. Every man, in my judgment, should say precisely what he means—keeping nothing back, here or elsewhere. . . .

What, then, is the position of the political parties of the country in relation to this subject? One of these parties professes to be guided by the most liberal principles. "Equal and exact justice to all men;" "equal rights for all men;" "inflexible opposition to oppression," are its favorite mottoes. It claims to be the true friend of popular government, and assumes the name of Democratic. . . .

They declaim loudly against all monopolies, all special privileges, all encroachments on personal rights, all distinctions founded upon birth; and compensate

themselves for these efforts of virtue, by practicing the vilest oppression upon all their countrymen, in whose complexion the slightest trace of African derivation can be detected. . . .

There is another party which boasts that it is conservative in its character. Its watchwords are, "a tariff," "a banking system," "the Union as it is." Among its members, also, are many sincere opponents of slavery. . . . Like the Democratic party, however, the Whig party maintains alliances with the slaveholder. It proposes, in its national conventions, no action against slavery. It has no anti-slavery article in its national creed. . . .

No question half so important as that of slavery engages the attention of the American people. All others, in fact, dwindle into insignificance in comparison with it. The question of slavery is, and until t shall be settled, must be, the paramount moral and political question of the day. We, at least, so regard it, and, so regarding it, must subordinate every other question to it.

It follows, as a necessary consequence, that we can not yield our political support to any party which does not take our ground upon the question.—*Warden, pp. 300, 304, 305, 308.*

August 6, 1849, he wrote to Lyman W. Hall as follows:

I am sure I had no idea that I was so bad a man as I have discovered myself to be since my election to the Senate. I always tried to pursue a straight-forward, frank course, conciliating always wheresoever conciliation did not involve a sacrifice of principle; but always ready to avow and maintain whatever principles I really held and to abide by them no matter how small the minority.

I was educated in the Whig school, and as a lawyer rather than as a politician. In my latter capacity I was always tolerably independent; but I held in the main the views which are now generally denominated Whig (though at the time, they were almost equally shared by both parties) up till 1840. In that year I supported Harrison, though *an advocate myself of the sub-treasury system.* . .

Convinced now that the question of slavery was the paramount one, and satisfied that the great principle of equal rights was correct, I began to test opinions by this standard. I was thus led to quite different views on the questions of bank, tariff and government, from those I had taken up, in trust without examination, and became unreservedly a Democrat—with Democratic principles too strong to allow of any compromise with slavery. Holding these principles, I was content to go into the minority of the liberty party and labor in it, when men counted me mad for so doing.

These principles, however, led the Democrats to consent to my support last winter, and I now hold them as unreservedly, and as absolutely, without compromise, as ever. All I desire is to see the old Democracy follow out their principles to the same conclusions. Then we can all stand together.—Warden, p. 331.

August 7, 1849, he wrote:

For myself, I have no love for political life; I am in it from necessity, not choice or advantage. Cheerfully would I resign my position to any man who would do my work in it. I am not insensible to its honors or advantages, but in my judgment, they are more than counterbalanced by its responsibilities and its discomforts. But I won't bore you with this, but, finding myself at the bottom of the second page, bid you farewell.—*Warden, p. 334.*

Letter to Lincoln after his nomination in 1860:

My Dear Sir:—I congratulate you, most heartily, on your nomination; and shall support you, in 1860, as cordially and earnestly as I did in 1858.

The excellent platform adopted, and the selection of that true and able man, Hannibal Hamlin, as your associate on the ticket, completes my satisfaction with the results of the convention. They will prove, I am confident, as auspicious to the country as they are honorable to the nominees.

Mr. Seward has much reason to be gratified by the large and cordial support which he received, and especially by the generous, unanimous, and constant adhesion, without regard to personal preferences, of the

entire delegation from his own great state. Doubtless, the similar adhesion of the Illinois delegation affords a higher gratification to you than the nomination itself.

The only regret I feel connected with the convention is excited by the failure of the delegation from Ohio to evince the same generous spirit. In this regret I am quite sure you must participate; for I err greatly in my estimate of your magnanimity if you do not condemn, as I do, the conduct of delegates from whatever state, who disregard, while acting as such, the clearly expressed preferences of their own state convention.—*Warden, p. 363.*

Chase writes to Trowbridge concerning his relations to Lincoln, and to the conference of states in 1861, in these words:

After his election, he invited me to Springfield to confer with me as to the selection of his Cabinet. He said that he had felt bound to offer the position of Secretary of State to Mr. Seward as the generally recog nized leader of the Republican party, intending, if he should decline it, to offer it to me. He did not wish that Mr. Seward should decline it and was glad that he had accepted, and now desired to have me take the place of Secretary of the Treasury. . . . I replied that I did not wish and was not prepared to say that I would accept that place if offered. . . . In Febru ary, Virginia invited a conference of the States at Washington, and appointed commissioners on her part. This conference, doubtless, was intended as a means of extorting new concessions to the slave interest from Congress. To prevent injurious results, it seemed necessary that there should be a general representation from all the states—from free as well as from the slave states which had become involved in secession. I was one of the commissioners selected by the governor to represent Ohio. Unfortunately I was the only one who was prepared to resist the purchase of peace by undue concessions. I was quite willing to give to the slave states the strongest assurances that no aggressions upon their rights or real interests were meditated, but I was not at all willing to disguise from them the fact that the further extension of slavery could not be allowed.—*Warden, pp. 364, 365.*

To his sister, Mrs. Hunt, living at New Orleans, Chase writes, November 30, 1860:

I abhor the very idea of a dissolution of the Union. If I were President I would, indeed, exhaust every expedient of forbearance, consistent with safety. But, at all hazards, and against all opposition, the laws of the Union should be enforced, through the judiciary whenever practicable, but against rebellion by all necessary means. The question of slavery should not be permitted to influence my action, one way or the other.

But, while I would thus act when circumstances should demand action, I would not shut my eyes to the fact, manifest to everybody, that it is from the slavery question that our chief dangers arise, and I should direct whatever influence I might possess to an adjustment of it, not by any new compromise—for new compromises only breed new dangers—but honest provision for the honest fulfillment of all constitutional obligations connected with it. Nothing seems to me clearer than that, under the constitution [Slavery is a] State institution, and that much embarrassment would have been avoided had this principle never been lost [sight of]. It would have assured peace to the states in which slavery exists, by uniting nearly all men of all opinions against any aggression upon them. Let this principle be now once more fully recognized and it will redress much of our trouble. The slave states can lose nothing, for few of their statesmen expect any farther extension of slavery. Disunion certainly is not extension. Disunion rather is abolition, and abolition through civil and servile war—which God forbid! It is precisely because they anticipate abolition as the result that the Garrison abolitionists desired disunion. . . .

Besides this question of extension there seems to be but one other which need occasion any anxiety. I refer of course to the extradition of escaping slaves. I have no doubt that the Constitution stipulates for such extradition; but I can not help seeing the natural sentiment and conscientious convictions make the execution of this stipulation everywhere difficult and, in the free States, well nigh impracticable; and I would not delude, or attempt to delude, anybody with the

notion of its execution under what some people call a "fair law," for all such propositions mean evasion, and I would evade nothing. It is high time to have done with evasions. Let us recognize facts as they are, frankly and boldly, and not try to creep away from them. In this spirit I would recognize the fact of the constitutional obligation and the fact that it cannot be fulfilled with any thing like completeness; and then I would see what could be done instead of literal fulfillment. It seems to me that compensation and provision for sending the fugitives out of the country would be better than any thing else that is practicable. It would be better for the Slave states, because the return of the fugitives is not in itself a desirable thing either from the individual from whom or the State from which he flies. It would be better for the free States, because it would involve nothing repugnant to the sentiments and convictions of the people. It would be better, infinitely better, for all than disunion. With these questions thus adjusted, peace would return, and harmony, and prosperity. Is there any better way? I see none. It is useless to attempt impossibilities.—*Warden, pp. 366, 367.*

A letter to General Scott, December 29, 1860:

. . . Imbecility, or treason, or both, mark all the action of the existing administration. Yesterday, while the armed bands of a State in open hostility against the National Government, were sizing Federal forts at Charleston, the so-called President and his Cabinet were in shameful conference with the commissioners of rebellion. And rebellion is treason until successful—which God forbid! for successful rebellion must needs be followed, and followed with swift steps, by civil and servile war. . . .

Take, then, the responsibility. In virtue of a commission which no other American, save Washington, ever held, you command the army of the United States. Preserve the Union which he established. .

In a few weeks, Mr. Lincoln, in obedience to the will of the country, will organize a new administration of the General Government, faithful to every constitu-

tional obligation and just to every State. Then, we may hope, disunion will hide its hateful head. . .— *Warden, pp. 367, 368.*

A letter to A. Taft, April 28, 1861:

As a positive policy, two alternatives were plainly before us. (1) That of enforcing the laws by its whole power and through its whole extent; or (2) that of recognizing the organization of actual government by the seven seceded States as an accomplished revolution—accomplished through the complicity of the late administration, and letting that Confederacy try its experiment of separation; but maintaining the authority of the Union and treating secession as treason everywhere else.

Knowing that the former of these alternatives involved destructive war, and vast expenditure, and oppressive debt, and thinking it possible, that through the latter these great evils might be avoided, the Union of the other States preserved unbroken, the return even of the seceded States, after an unsatisfactory experiment of separation, secured, and the great cause of freedom and constitutional government peacefully vindicated—thinking, I say, these things possible, I preferred the latter alternative.

The attack on Fort Sumter, however, and the precipitation of Virginia into hostility to the National Government, made this latter alternative impracticable, and I had then no hesitation about recurring to the former.— *Warden, p. 371.*

The following extracts are taken from the Appeal of the Independent Democrats, of January 23, 1854:

We arraign this bill [Kansas-Nebraska] as a gross violation of a sacred pledge; as a criminal betrayal of precious rights; as part and parcel of an atrocious plot to exclude from a vast unoccupied region immigrants from the Old World and free laborers from our own states, and convert it into a dreary region of despotism, inhabited by masters and slaves.

Take your maps, fellow-citizens, we entreat you, and see what country it is which this bill gratuitiously and recklessly proposes to open to slavery. . . .

This immense region, occupying the very heart of the North American Continent, and larger, by thirty-three thousand square miles, than all the existing free states —including California; this immense region, well watered and fertile, . . . and now for more than thirty years regarded by the common consent of the American people as consecrated to freedom by statute and by compact—this immense region the bill now before the Senate, without reason and without excuse, but in flagrant disregard of sound policy and sacred faith, purposes to open to slavery. . . .

We confess our total inability properly to delineate the character or describe the consequences of this measure. Language fails to express sentiments of indignation and abhorrence which it inspires: and no vision less penetrating and comprehensive than that of the All-Seeing can reach its evil issues.

We appeal to the people. We warn you that the dearest interests of freedom and the Union are in imminent peril. Demagogues may tell you that the Union can be maintained only by submitting to the demands of slavery. We tell you that the Union can only be maintained by the full recognition of the just claims of freedom and man. The Union was formed to establish justice and secure the blessings of liberty. When it fails to accomplish these ends it will be worthless, and when it becomes worthless it cannot long endure.

We entreat you to be mindful of that fundamental maxim of Democracy—Equal Rights and Exact Justice for all Men. Do not submit to become agents in extending legalized oppression and systematized injustice over a vast territory yet exempt from these terrible evils. . . .

Whatever apologies may be offered for the toleration of slavery in the States, none can be offered for its extension into Territories where it does not exist. . . .

For ourselves, we shall resist it by speech and vote, and with all the abilities which God has given us. Even if overcome in the impending struggle, we shall not submit. We shall go home to our constituents, erect anew the standard of freedom, and call on the people to come to the rescue of the country from the domination of slavery. We will not despair; for the

cause of human freedom is the cause of God.—*Schucker's Life of Chase, pp. 141, 142, 146, 147.*

Chase to Seward, January 11, 1861:

My dear Sir: You are to be Secretary of State. The post is yours by right and you will have the post. My best wishes go with you. Permit me a few words about matters in which we have a deep common interest.

The telegraph reports that you are to speak on Saturday. Let me urge you to give countenance to no scheme of compromise. Mr. Lincoln will be inaugurated in a few days. Then the Republicans will be charged with the responsibility of administration. Then, too, they will control one branch of the Government.

To me it seems all-important that no compromise be now made, and no concession involving any surrender of principles; but that the people of the Slave States, and of all the states, be plainly told that the Republicans have no proposition to make at present; that when they have the power they will be ready to offer an adjustment, fair and beneficial to all sections of the country. . . . *Schucker's, p. 202.*

In a communication to the Committee of Ways and Means, we find this language:

The provision making the United States notes a legal tender has doubtless been well considered by the committee, and their conclusion needs no support from any observation of mine. I think it my duty to say, however, that in respect to this provision my reflections have conducted me to the same conclusions they have reached. It is not unknown to them that I have felt, nor do I wish to conceal that I now feel, a great aversion to making anything but coin a legal tender in payment of debts. It has been my anxious wish to avoid the necessity of such legislation. It is at present, impossible, however, in consequence of the large expenditures entailed by the war and the suspension of the banks, to procure sufficient coin for current disbursements; and it has therefore become indispensably necessary that we should resort to the issue of United States notes. The making them a legal tender might still be avoided if the willingness manifested by the people generally, by railroad companies and by many

of the banking institutions, to receive and pay them as money in all transactions were absolutely or practically universal. . . . *Schucker's, p. 244.*

From Hepburn vs. Griswold, 1868.

IV. There is in the Constitution no express grant of legislative power to make any description of credit currency a legal tender in payment of debts. VII. The making of notes or bills of credit a legal tender in payment of pre-existing debts is not a means appropriate, plainly adapted, or really calculated to carry into effect any express power vested in Congress; is inconsistent with the spirit of the Constitution; and is prohibited by the Constitution.—*Schucker's, p. 260.*

A letter to John Roberts, May 21, 1861:

In making appointments, my rule always has been to give the preference to political friends, except in cases where peculiar fitness and talents made the preference of a political opponent a public duty. In selecting among political friends, I have ever aimed to get the right man in the right place, without much reference to personal consequences to myself. Of course, I like as much as any man to favor personal friends, but I have never thought it right to appoint a man to office merely because he was such, without a careful consideration of his qualifications for the place. I have ever held my country as my best friend, and value those friends most who serve her most faithfully. Is there anything blameworthy in all this? . . .

You know my views—the public first, our friends next. So far as preferences can be legitimately given so as to aid those who, at considerable sacrifice of time, labor, and money, are engaged in upholding the principles we all deem vitally important to the welfare of the country, I think it a clear political duty that they should be given. But no public interest should be sacrificed, no public duty should be neglected, for any personal or party consideration.—*Schuckers, pp. 274, 275.*

To Wm. P. Mellen, March 26, 1862:

. . . I am not fond of political metaphysics. The article in the Evening Post, which you send me, suits me well enough While I think that the Government

in suppression of the rebellion, and in view of the destruction by suicide of the rebel State governments with the actual or strongly implied consent of a majority of their citizens, may regard those States as having so far forfeited their rights that they may justly be treated as Territories, I have never proposed to make this opinion the basis of political measures. I much prefer to regard each State as still existing intact, and to be subject to no change of boundaries except such as may be freely consented to by its people. I want to keep all the stars, and all the stripes; and to keep all the States with their old names and ensigns. South Carolina should be South Carolina still; but reformed, I hope. I would preserve, not destroy, and I prefer civil provisional government, authorized by Congress, to military government instituted by the President.—*Schuckers, p. 364.*

To B. R. Wood, Copenhagen, Denmark, April 2, 1862:

There have been other occasions in the course of the struggle in which it seemed to me that a different course from that actually adopted would have been better. This is especially true in relation to slavery. It has seemed to me from the early days of the conflict that it was bad policy as well as bad principle to give any support to the institution. . . .

My idea was—not to declare emancipation—but simply to treat the population just as we found it, loyal or disloyal; and the black loyalist better than a white rebel, and the same as a white loyalist. And I could see no valid objection to enlisting acclimated blacks, loyal and willing to serve, any more than enlisting white ones. But I have not been able to make our friends in the administration see as I have seen: and I certainly do not claim to be more wise than they. When therefore, I am overruled, I have quietly submitted doing all I could to carry forward the cause and the work, if not in my preferred way, yet in the best way possible for me.—*Schuckers, p. 366.*

June 24, 1862, to Major General Butler, New Orleans:

. . . In my judgment, it is indispensable to fix upon some principle of action and abide by it. Until long after the fall of Sumter, I clung to my old ideas of non-interference with Slavery within State limits by the Federal Government. It was my hope and belief that the rebellion might be suppressed, and slavery left to the free disposition of the States within which the institution existed. By them, I thought it certain that the removal of the institution would be gradually effected without shock or disturbance or injury, but peaceably and beneficially. But the war has been protracted far beyond my anticipations, and with the postponement of decisive results came increased bitterness and intensified alienation of nearly the entire white population of the slave States. With this state of facts came the conviction to my mind that the restoration of the old Union with slavery untouched except by the mere weakening effects of the war, was impossible. Looking attentively at the new state of things, I became satisfied that a great majority of the people of the United States had made up their minds that the constitutional supremacy of the national Government should be vindicated, and the territorial integrity of the country maintained, come or go what might. I became satisfied also that to secure the accomplishment of these great objects, slavery must go. . . .

I begin with the proposition that we must either abandon the attempt to retain the Gulf States, or that we must give freedom to every slave within their limits. We cannot maintain the contest with the disadvantages of unacclimated troops and distant supplies against an enemy able to bring one-half the population under arms. with the other half held to labor, at no cost except that of bare subsistence, for the armed moiety. . . .

As to the border states, even including Arkansas, a different rule may be adopted. In these states the President's plan of compensated emancipation may be adequate to a solution of the slavery question; though I confess my apprehensions that the slaveholders of these States will delay acceptance of the proposition until it will become impossible to induce Congress to vote the compensation. . . *Schuckers, pp. 375, 377.*

To Major General John Pope, August 1, 1862:

Allow me to express a hope that you will deal generously and kindly with the blacks, who are almost all loyal. They have rendered great services in many cases, and have then been given up to slavery. This is too bad. If I were in the field, I would let every man understand that no man loyal to the Union can be a slave. We must come to this. The public sentiment of the world, common-sense, and common justice, demand it. The sooner we respect the demand, the better for us and for our cause.—*Schuckers, pp. 378, 379.*

To Senator John Sherman, September 20, 1862:

Since General Halleck has been here the conduct of the war has been abandoned to him by the President almost absolutely. We who are called members of the Cabinet, but are in reality only separate heads of Departments, meeting now and then for talk on whatever happens to come uppermost—not for grave consultation on matters concerning the salvation of the country—we have as little to do with it as if we were heads of factories supplying shoes or clothing. No regular and systematic reports of what is done are made, I believe, even to the President; certainly none are made to the Cabinet.—*Schuckers, p. 379.*

To Horace Greeley, January 28, 1863:

. . . Why don't you—who can so well point out the path which others ought to walk—do your part toward the great and indispensable work of establishing a uniform national currency. . . .

But this is apart from the great question—which is not second to any connected with the war itself at this time. What financial measures can take us back to the firm ground from which the legislation of last session freed us? . . . The main point is the banking bill. A circulation issued directly by the Government cannot be made a good currency. The difficulty is partly in the nature of the thing and partly in the nature of men. The total difficulty is unsurmountable, and so says all experience.—*Schuckers, pp. 386, 387.*

Concerning the arrest of Vallandigham, he writes, June 15, 1863:

. . . If Vallandigham violated any law, he should have been arrested, tried, and convicted. . . .

I have never myself been much afraid of words; and when men (Vallandigham among them) have sought to cripple the financial administration by misrepresentation and villification, I have preferred to reply by augmented efforts in the service of the country rather than by arrest and imprisonment.—*Schuckers, p. 391.*

To Ex-Governor William Sprague, November 26, 1863; to Jacob Heaton, January 28, 1864; and to Seward, May 30, 1864:

. . . If I were controlled by merely personal sentiments, I should prefer the reelection of Mr. Lincoln to that of any other man. But I doubt the expediency of re-electing anybody, and I think a man of different qualities from those the President has will be needed for the next four years. I am not anxious to be regarded as that man; and I am quite willing to leave that question to the decision of those who agree in thinking that some such man should be chosen. . . .

I can never permit myself to be driven into any hostile or unfriendly position as to Mr. Lincoln. His course toward me has always been so fair and kind; his progress toward entire agreement with me on the great question of slavery has been so constant, though rather slower than I wished for, and his general character is so marked by traits which command respect and affection, that I can never consent to anything which he himself could or would consider as incompatible with perfect honor and good faith, if I were capable—which I hope I am not—of a departure from either, even where an enemy might be concerned. . . . I should despise myself if I felt capable of appointing or removing a man for the sake of the presidency. . . .

I have never sought to manage newspapers. If they have supported me I have been glad of it and grateful. If they have opposed, it has been their own matter, and I have let them take their course. I have never under-

taken and never shall undertake to manipulate the press. . . .

So far as the presidency is concerned, I must leave that wholly to the people. . . .

So far as its allegation concerns me personally, they are utterly without warrant. In the sense intended by the words, I have never been a presidential aspirant. Since my letter to Senator Hall, or rather, through him to my friends in Ohio, I have avoided all thought and talk about the presidential nomination, and have certainly neither asked nor sought nor expected it myself.

The patronage of this department is not and never has been used with reference to that nomination.—*Schuckers, pp. 494, 495, 497, 505.*

From Mr. Chase's journal July 13, 1864:

. . . I have seen the President twice since I have been here. Both times third persons were present, and there was nothing like private conversation. His manner was cordial and so were his words; and I hear of nothing but good-will from him. But he is not at all demonstrative, either in speech or manner. I feel that I do not know him, and I found no action on what he says or does. . . . It is my conviction that the cause I love and the general interests of the country will be best promoted by his re-election, and I have resolved to join my efforts to those of almost the whole body of my friends in securing it. . . . I have been told that the President said he and I could not get along together in the Cabinet. Doubtless there was a difference of temperament, and on some points, of judgment. I may have been too earnest and eager, while I thought him not earnest enough and too slow. On some occasions, indeed, I found that it was so. But I never desired anything else than his complete success, and never indulged a personal feeling incompatible with absolute fidelity to his administration. To assure that success I labored incessantly in the Treasury Department, with what results the world knows. . . . It is now certain that Mr. Lincoln will be reelected. May his name go down to posterity with the two noblest additions historians ever recorded—Restorer and Liberator.—*Schuckers, pp. 511, 512.*

Extracts from letters to various persons from April 12, 1865, to March 16, 1868, concerning Reconstruction:

Once I should have been, if not satisfied, partially, at least, contented with suffrage for the intelligent and for those who have been soldiers; now I am convinced that universal suffrage is demanded by sound policy and impartial justice. . . .

I observe that you say that the attempt to carry on the Government with the privilege of universal suffrage incorporated as one of its elements is full of danger. Danger is the condition of all governments; because no form of government insures wise and beneficent administration. But I beg you to consider, is there not a greater danger without than with universal suffrage? You cannot make suffrage less than universal for the whites, and will not the attempt to discriminate excite such jealousies and illfeeling as will postpone to a distant future what seems so essential, namely, the restoration of general good will and bringing into lead the educated men and the men of property, and so securing the best and most beneficial administration of affairs for all classes? Take universal suffrage and universal amnesty, and all will be well. Can you, my dear sir, devote your fine powers to a better work than complete restoration on this basis? . . .

I have no sympathy with the spirit which refuses to strew flowers upon the graves of the dead soldiers who fought against the side I took; and I am glad to know that there was no such spirit among those who joined in decorating the graves of the soldiers of the Union who lie buried in Magnolia Cemetery. . . .

I notice that you more than intimate that my letter was prompted by ambition. It certainly was not. I do not think that I ever was so ambitious as some unambitious people have represented me. At any rate, I am now unconscious of any other ambition than that of doing as much good and as little harm as possible. . . . I never favored interference by Congress with slavery in the states; but, as a war measure, Mr. Lincoln's proclamation of emancipation had my hearty

assent, and I united, as a member of his Administration, in the pledge it made to maintain the freedom of the enfranchised people. This pledge has been partly redeemed by the constitutional amendment prohibiting slavery throughout the United States; but its perfect fulfillment requires, in my judgment, the assurance of the right of suffrage to those whom the Constitution has made freemen and citizens. Hence, I have been and am in favor of so much of the reconstruction policy of Congress as bases the reorganization of the State governments in the South upon universal suffrage. . . . I have been a steady friend to the congressional policy of reconstruction so far as it has contemplated equal rights for all, secured by equal constitutions and laws. But I do not believe in military domination any more than I do in a slaveholding oligarchy; nor do I believe that anything has been accomplished by military supremacy in the rebel States that could not have been as well, if not better, accomplished by civil supremacy, authorized and regulated by Congress, with military subordination. But I prefer even military domination for a time, itself controlled and directed by Congress, with an honest reference to restoration of the States to full participation in the government, with suffrage secured to all who will not seek to withhold it from others, to any such plan as that proposed by the President.—*Schuckers, pp. 517, 529, 530, 563, 575.*

QUESTIONS

(1) What characteristic do you find manifested in Chase's early training? (2) What conceptions in Massachusetts of Ohio in early days? (3) What did his uncle think about government clerkships? (4) Did he care for society? (5) When admitted to the law?

(1) How did Chase regard slavery? (2) Bring all the proofs you can find to prove your position. (3) What parties can you find proof for his having belonged to? (4) How true to their professions does he find political parties? (5) Did he love political life? (6) Proofs to sustain your answer. (7) How did he regard Lincoln? (8) Was he favorable or not to compromise in 1860–'61? (9) Find all passages bearing on the subject. (10) How did he regard Buchanan's policy of 1861? (11) What would have been his plan? (12) What is the main thought you get from his letter to his sister? (13) Does his letter to Taft agree with his other writings?

(1) What was his opinion of the Kansas-Nebraska bill? (2) What danger did he see in it? (3) Compare his letter to Seward with his letter to Taft. (4) Was he a believer in making United States notes [greenbacks] legal tender? (5) Compare his positions on the subject in 1862 and 1868. (6) What relation did he believe the southern seceded states bore to the Union?

(1) How would he treat the negroes? (2) Collect the proofs for your answer. (3) Was he a believer in the arrest of Vallandigham? (4) Was he favorable to Lincoln's re-election in 1864? (5) What view did he take of the plan adopted in regard to the reconstruction of the southern states? (6) Write a life of S. P. Chase based on these documents.

JAMES GILLESPIE BLAINE

Born in Pennsylvania, 1830. Graduate of Washington and Jefferson College. Taught school in Kentucky, 1847-50. Citizen of Maine, 1854. Member of Maine legislature, 1858-1862. Member of House of Representatives, 1862-1876. Speaker, 1869-1876. Candidate for nomination for President, 1876, 1880, 1892. Candidate, 1884. Senator, 1876-1881. Secretary of state, 1881, 1889-1892. Died, 1893.

CHAPTER X

JAMES GILLESPIE BLAINE

WE began this series of studies with Albert Gallatin. It is now brought to a close with the death of Blaine in 1893. Practically one hundred years of American history have been covered, as Gallatin may be said to have come into prominence as a national statesman about 1793.

Four generations of American legislators may be said to have passed across the political stage. Of these Gallatin only, of those we have studied, belonged to the earliest period. Jefferson, Madison, Hamilton, and Monroe also come before us asdistinguished men who might well have had a place in our list. However, most of them would more properly, perhaps, be classed with Washington as great administrators rather than with Gallatin as legislators. In the second period we have studied J. Q. Adams, Clay, Webster, and Calhoun, four men who stand out pre-eminent among the statesmen of their time. In the main we have considered these men from the standpoint of legislators. Each of them, however, was great also as an administrator, and some of them achieved fame in diplomacy as well. Lincoln's name is the only one in the third quarter of our century that may be said to tower above those that we have studied, and his name is distinguished in

other fields than that of legislation. Seward, Sumner, Chase, and Douglas were dominant forces in American politics in the years just before and during the Civil War. Of those who have struggled primarily with the problem of reconstruction and other post-bellum questions only one name has been considered—the name of Blaine; perhaps not the most constructive statesman of this fourth period, but the one who had on the whole the greatest popular following.

The extracts made bring out, it is hoped, the main points in Blaine's early life, as well as the principles for which he stood in his more mature years. There is no adequate collection of his letters and speeches as yet made, so it becomes much more difficult than in the cases of the other men we have studied to make the best selections. Perhaps also we are yet too near his period to appreciate fully the strong and the weak points in his career. Time only can tell what his ultimate place in American history will be.

Blaine's father was quite a skillful politician. Once he was charged with being a Catholic, as his wife was. He asked the Catholic priest for a statement to the contrary and received the following. He was equal to the emergency, however, and succeeded in winning the election:

This is to certify that Ephraim L. Blaine is not now and never was a member of the Catholic church; and furthermore, in my opinion, he is not fit to be a member of any church. . . . —*Gail Hamilton's Life of Blaine, p. 73.*

A note from an early friend:

You know, and perhaps he knew, what my feeling toward him was, always has been, with no weakening

or shadow of turning. He buckled one's heart to him with "hooks of steel." I so well remember when and where I saw him first. It was when he was in college, in Washington, at a gay little picnic He was the life and the light of the fete, so joyous were his spirits, so incessant the play of his wit. . . . —*Life of Blaine, p. 78.*

Recommendations from Blaine's Professors, October 1, 1847:

Mr. James G. Blaine having gone through a regular and full course in Washington College Penn. was graduated Sept. 29, 1847. During the whole period of his connection with College he maintained the character of a very punctual, orderly, diligent and successful student. His demeanor was always respectful, and becoming a gentleman. When graduated, to him with two others, was awarded the first Honor of a large, & respectable class of thirty-three. He is of one of the most respectable families of Washington County; & bt propriety of conduct, polite and pleasing manners will entitle himself to a place in the best society. If he should become an Instructor in a High School, Academy, or College, his talents, literary acquirements, dignity, decision, fidelity, & prudence will not fail to merit the confidence, & approbation of those who may obtain his services. . . .

Of your qualifications for teaching, so far as these depend upon character and scholarship, I may speak with the highest confidence. Your knowledge of the languages especially, being critical beyond what is often attained at college, fits you in a special manner for the office of instructor in this department.

In a word, sir, I feel assured that those who may be so fortunate as to secure your services in this capacity will, when you become known to them as you are known to us, be satisfied that no recommendation of ours has been in the least exaggerated.

The professor of mathematics thought it "but justice to him to say that in my department Mr. Blaine specially excels. From the commencement of his course in mathematical studies he manifested a peculiar fondness for them; his recitations gave evidence of thorough investigation, and his demonstrations were

characterized by clearness, accuracy, and precision."—*Life of Blaine, pp. 80, 81.*

Blaine writes of himself to a friend in these words, in 1869:

. . . From Lexington he went to Louisville, thence to Maysville, thence to Cincinnati, and the morning he left the last-named place, December 4, [1837] he heard that Robert C. Winthrop was just elected speaker of the United States House of Representatives. He immediately notified his friends that he was a candidate for the succession, and in the incredibly brief space of twenty-two years he attained the place—a remarkable instance of faith, patience, and despatch harmoniously combined. But I do not mean to imply that there is any immediate, or palpable, or recognizable connection between the rainy Sunday of Lexington in November, 1847, and my election to the speakership in 1869.—*Life of Blaine, p. 85.*

In a letter of December 2, 1847, to his friend J. M. Clark, he says:

I have procured a situation as assistant teacher of languages in the Western Military Institute located at Georgetown. . . . I will have to teach the preparatory course in Latin and Greek, and have a class in Davis's Elementary Algebra, so you see my situation will be a very pleasant one as regards the branches I have to teach. . . . I have no doubt now but that he will be the Whig candidate; even if he is not he can run as an Independent, and such is the wild enthusiasm of the American people for a military hero that he will run ahead of anything that either party can bring out. . . . For my part, I would rather see James Buchanan president than General Taylor, if he had not had so large a fist in the affairs of the present administration. That will ruin him. . . . In conclusion, I would just say that I would like to see both candidates selected from among the citizens. I don't like these military presidents that "go in" on account of their "gunpowder popularity."—*Life, pp. 86, 89.*

His political tendencies may be seen in these extracts from a letter to T. B. Searight April 8, 1849:

Although there have been few removals made, you Democrats need not flatter yourselves that this administration is going to play the "*betwixt and between*" —pursue a temporizing policy. You will find that about June and July and along there the heads will begin to come off pretty rapidly. I am *looking for and hoping for a General Decapitation.* I have had some advices from headquarters, and this opinion is formed from them. . . . You have no doubt seen Mr. Clay's letter. He is strong for emancipation and colonization, but he has many bitter and able opponents to encounter, and the day has long since gone by when Henry Clay's will was law in Kentucky.—*Life, p. 95.*

His next moves are seen in these extracts:

My address after first September will be Pennsylvania Institute for the Blind. . . . November 16, 1854, the Kennebec Journal announced that the establishment had been "sold to Messrs. Joseph Baker and J. G. Blaine, who would thereafter conduct its editorial and business affairs.—*Life, pp. 97, 100.*

In the midst of politics as this extract shows:

I think the nomination the very best that could have been made in every way, and I have no more doubt of the election of the ticket than I have that Maine will be carried by the Republicans. Governor Morrill and myself worked hard for Lincoln from the time we reached Chicago, and you may depend we feel no little gratification at the result. . . .—*Life, p. 129.*

In 1860 he writes to Geo. H. Andrews as follows, declining to stand as a candidate for Congress; in 1862, however, he was nominated, and he accepts, in the words quoted below:

My dear Sir:—Your kind and friendly favor of the 23d is before me. The tender of your support for the honorable post of representative in Congress is exceedingly gratifying and flattering to me, and proves that I have not reckoned amiss in counting you among my most earnest friends. It is proper, however, to advise you that I am not a candidate for that position. It may possibly be known to you that Ex-Governor Morrill desires the nomination, and I should consider it both

ungenerous and unjust for me to allow my name to be used against him. He has done much and sacrificed much for the Republican party in the day of its trial and its need, and the opportunity seems now to be presented for suitably and cordially recognizing his worth and his services. You can readily see how unbecoming it would be in a man of my years to contest the nomination with him, even if I personally desired to do so. Its effect could only be to divide the hitherto harmonious ranks of the Republicans of Kennebec.

I shall therefore most cheerfully support Governor Morrill for the nomination, and shall urge all my friends to do the same. . . .

In this accepting speech [1862] he announced as his platform—Abraham Lincoln. "If I am called to a seat in Congress, I shall go there with a determination to stand heartily and unreservedly by the administration of Abraham Lincoln. In the success of that administration, under the good providence of God, rests, I solemnly believe, the fate of the American Union. If we cannot subdue the rebellion through the Agency of the administration, there is no other power given under Heaven among men to which we can appeal. Hence I repeat that I shall conceive it to be my duty, as your representative, to be the unswerving adherent of the Policy and measures which the President in his wisdom may adopt. The case is one, in the present exigency, where men loyal to the Union cannot divide. The President is Commander-in-Chief of our land and naval forces, and while he may be counselled he must not be opposed."

On the great question which had already become not slavery, but emancipation, he spoke with veiled, but not vague voice: "The great object with us all is to subdue the rebellion speedily, effectually, finally. In our march to that end we must crush all intervening obstacles. If slavery, or any other "institution," stands in the way, it must be removed. Perish all things else, the national life must be saved. My individual convictions of what may be needful are perhaps in advance of those entertained by some, and less radical than those conscientiously held by others. Whether they are the one or the other, however, I do not wish

to see an attempt made to carry them out until it can be done by an administration sustained by the resistless energy of the loyal masses. I think, myself, those masses are rapidly adopting the idea that to smite the rebellion its malignant cause must be smitten."—*Life, pp. 137, 138.*

His views in regard to the future taxation problems of the country are foreshadowed in this extract:

In March, 1865, defending an amendment of the Constitution, which should strike out the clause that forbids the taxing of exports, in a speech, which caused an extraordinary agitation throughout the country, he had declared that in the future of our country "the great task and test of statesmanship will be in the administration of our finances and the wise distribution of the burdens of taxation. . . . An immense amount of money will be required to meet the interest of our National debt, to maintain our army and navy—even on a peace foundation, and to defray the ordinary expenses of civil government. The revenue for these objects may be raised so injudiciously as to cripple and embarrass the commercial and industrial interests of the whole country; or on the other hand, the requisite tax may be so equitably distributed and so skilfuly assessed that the burden will be inappreciable to the public. Whoever, as Secretary of the Treasury, shall accomplish the latter and avoid the former result, must be armed with a plentitude of power in the premises. He must have open to him the three great avenues of taxation—the tariff, the excise system and the duties on exports; and must be empowered to use each in its appropriate place by Congressional legislation. At present, only two of these modes of taxation are available and the absence of the third takes from the general government half the regulation of trade. It is for Congress to say whether the people shall have an opportunity to change the organic law in this important respect, or whether with a blind disregard of the future we shall rush forward, reckless of the financial disasters that may result from a failure to do our duty here." . . *Life, pp. 195, 196.*

In regard to a bill to prevent the appointment of sons of southern men who had been in rebellion, he said:

. . . I differ entirely with the Committee. I do not believe in punishing children in the rebel states. When this war began the persons eligible to be appointed to West Point were nine, ten or eleven years of age, and I do not propose to punish them for the faults of their fathers. . . . I am opposed to keeping up this imaginary line. I should think the gentleman from Pennsylvania would see—if I had not a great respect for him, I would say—the absurdity of such a notion.—*Life, p. 200.*

Again, in 1869–70, we see something of his political views in a debate over the appropriation bill. He said, in part:

It will be observed that the total amount appropriated by the bill is $43,199,500. . . . I desire for myself, to say now, as I said then, that it is my conviction that the army ought to be reduced. I had the honor to introduce last year a provision in the Army Appropriation Bill for the reduction of the army, which did not meet with the concurrence or approval of the House. . . . Therefore, the Committee on Appropriations have not this year made any recommendation touching that question. But in order to preserve my own consistency, which is important to me if not to other people, I hold now that instead of sixty regiments, this Congress, or, if not, the very next, ought to provide for the reduction of the army to thirty regiments, or just one-half what it now is.

General Grant, as General-in-Chief of the Army during the past year, has done everything within the existing law, and under the power that the law confers upon him, to reduce the army. . . . —*Life, p. 201.*

January 16, 1869, he writes:

You write very sensibly about the speakership. Do not imagine that I am unduly excited about it, or that I desire it with an intensity which leaves me unprepared for failure and its consequent disappointment and chagrin. I have measured the whole matter

calmly, logically, and philosophically. I mean to win if I can fairly and honorably. If I cannot, there's the end. But if successful, I shall not have the self-reproach of having done one unworthy act to secure the place; and if unsuccessful, the same consciousness will be my compensating and consoling fact.

Again, January 4, 1871, he says:

I have been round to the White House since dinner to call on the President. He sent for me and we had a frank chat on San Domingo. I will support the resolution of inquiry, but am against the final acquisition.

In an address before the Northern Wisconsin Agricultural Society, in speaking of public and private debts, he said in part:

Debts have originated . . . not to promote the ends of peace, not to develop agricultural or the mechanic arts, not to improve harbors and the navigation of rivers, not to found institutions of learning, or of charity, or of mercy, not to elevate the standard of culture among the masses, not for any or all of these laudable objects, but for the waste, the cruelty, the untold agonies of war. The vast mass of this prodigious sum-total not only went for war, but for wars of ambition and conquest, in which the fate of reigning dynasties was the stake, and not the well-being of the people or even the aggrandizement of the nation itself in the higher and better sense. . . .

But in regard to the national debt, whatever vain regrets we may indulge over the loss of so much treasure and the fearful sacrifice of that which is beyond earthly price, we have this to console,—that the war which gave rise to it was unavoidable, apparently forecast as part of the great experience of bitterness and of blood through which it was our destiny as a nation to pass, and that out of its sorrowful depths, we have emerged a regenerated people, doing justice to a race long oppressed, educated ourselves to higher standards of liberty and of law, and having our feet henceforth shod with the preparation of the Gospel of Peace.—*Life, p. 312.*

Politics again, 1877:

. . . I do not believe a new departure is called

for. To the common mind, unbiased and unprejudiced, no difficulty presents itself under the constitutional provision. By that I would stand, and declare Hayes elected, and inaugurate him, and if the Democrats wish to appeal to the courts, let them do so, and we will quietly abide their decision. The calling in members of the court to sit with coordinate branches of the government upon questions which may be presented to them to decide judicially is, to say the least, questionable, and to my mind unconstitutional.—*Life, pp. 405, 406.*

The view taken by Blaine in regard to withdrawing the troops from Louisiana, in 1877, may be seen in this extract:

The electoral commission decided that the Louisiana returning board was a legal and constitutional body competent to do what it did. What it did do was to declare who were the presidential electors of that State; it did also declare who were the legislature; and the Legislature, performing a mere ministerial duty, declared who was the governor; and I stand here, if I stand alone, to say that the honor and the credit and the faith of the Republican party, in so far as the election of Hayes and Wheeler is concerned, are as indissolubly united in maintaining the rightfulness of the return of that body as the illustrious House of Hanover that sits on the throne of England to-day is in maintaining the rightfulness of the Revolution of 1688. Discredit Packard and you discredit Hayes. Hold that Packard is not the legal governor of Louisiana, and President Hayes has no title, and the honored vice-president, who presides over our deliberations, has no title to his chair. The Legislature, the governor, and the presidential electors of Louisiana, all derive their legality and their right to act from the same source and the same count, and if the one is discredited, the other is discredited.

I know that there has been a great deal said here and there, in the corridors of the capitol, around and about, in by-places and high-places, of late, that some arrangements had been made by which Packard was not to be recognized and upheld. I want to know who had the authority to make any such arrangement? I

deny it. I deny it without being authorized to speak for the administration that now exists. But I deny it on the simple broad ground that it is an impossibility. . . . I deny it on the broad ground that President Hayes possesses character, common-sense, self-respect patriotism, all of which he has in high measure. I deny it on all the grounds that can influence human action, on all the grounds on which men can be held to personal and political and official responsibility. I deny it for him, and I shall find myself grievously disappointed, wounded and mutilated if my denial is not vindicated in the policy of the administration. But whether it be vindicated, or wheter it be not, I care not. It is not the duty of a Senator to inquire what the policy of an administration may be, but what it ought to be; and I hope that a Republican Senate will say that on this point there shall be no authority in this land large enough or adventurous enough to compromise the honor of the national administration or the good name of the great Republican party that called that administration into existence.—*Proceedings Senate, March 6, 1877.*

In connection with the exclusion of the Chinese from the United States, Blaine said:

. . . We have on this day to choose whether we shall have for the Pacific Coast the civilization of Christ or the civilization of Confucius.

The allegation that the exclusion of the Chinese is inhumane and unchristian need not be considered in presence of the fact that their admission to the country provokes conflict which the laws are unable to restrain.

The wealthy classes in a republic where suffrage is universal cannot safely legislate for cheap labor.

Nowhere on earth has free labor been brought in competition with any form of servile labor in which the free labor did not come down to the level of the servile labor. . . . The lower strata pull down the upper. The upper never elevate the lower.

I feel that I am pleading the cause of the free American laborer, and of his children, and of his children's children, the cause of "the house against the hovel, of

the comfort of the freeman against the squalor of the slave. . . . *Life, p. 450.*

Do we see the politician or the statesman in the following extract?

I received your friendly letter with much pleasure. Let me say in reply, that the course of yourself and other Irish voters is one of the most extraordinary anomalies in our political history. Never, probably, since the execution of Robert Emmett, has the feeling of Irishmen, the world over been so bitter against England and Englishmen as it is at this hour; and yet the great mass of the Irish voters in the United States will on Tuesday next, vote precisely as Englishmen would have them vote—for the interests of England.

Having seen Ireland reduced to misery and driven to despair by what they regard as the unjust policy of England, the Irishmen of America use their suffrage as though they were the agents and servants of the English Tories. The Free-traders of England desire nothing so much as the defeat of Garfield and the election of Hancock. They wish to break down the protective tariff and cripple our manufacturers, and nine-tenths of the Irish voters in this country respond with alacrity, "Yes, we will do your bidding and vote to please you, even though it reduce our own wages and take the bread from the mouths of our children."

There are many able men and many clever writers among the Irish in America, but I have never met any one of them able enough or clever enough to explain this anomaly on any basis of logic and good sense.

I am glad to see from your esteemed favor that the subject is beginning to trouble you. The more you think of it the more you will be troubled, I am sure. And you will be driven finally to the conclusion that the prosperity of the Irish in this country depends as largely as that of any other class upon the maintenance of the financial and industrial policy represented by the Republican party.—*Letter in "Bangor Whig and Courier," October 29, 1880.*

Blaine writes to Garfield, after the election of the latter to the presidency, as follows, De-

ccmbcr 10, 1880; and following dates, till February 16, 1881:

But the Grant forces were never more busy than at this hour. . . Of course it would not be wise to make war on them. Indeed, that would be folly. They must not be knocked down with bludgeons: they must have their throats cut with a feather. . . The Republican party of this country is divided into three sections. First, the great body of the North, with Congressional representation and electoral strength behind it, is with the section which for convenience of designation I will call the Blaine section,—I mean the strength behind me in two national conventions. . .

The secoı d section is the Grant section, taking all the South practically, with the machine in New York, Pennsylvania, and Illinois—and having the aim of rule or ruin leaders. . . I think I am not wrong in saying that this section contains all the desperate bad men of the party, bent on *loot* and booty, and ready for any Mexican invasion or Caribbean annexation and looking to excitements and fillibustering and possibly to a Spanish war as legitimate means of continuing political power for a clique. These men are to be handled with skill, always remembering that they are harmless when out of power, and desperate when in possession of it.

The third section is the Reformers by profession, the "unco good." They are to be treated with respect, but they are the worst possible political advisers—upstarts, conceited, foolish, vain, without knowledge of measures, ignorant of men, shouting a shibboleth which represents nothing of practical reform that you are not a thousand times pledged to. They are noisy, but not numerous, pharisaical but not practical, ambitious but not wise, pretentious but not powerful! They can be easily dealt with, and can be hitched to your administration with ease. I could handle them myself without trouble. You can do it more easily still.

In this threefold division of the Republican party, your true friends will be found on the first. .

In the second section will be found all the men who have an ulterior purpose, who accept your administration because they cannot help it, and are looking as

longingly to a restoration of Grant as the cavaliers of England, in the time of the Protector, looked for a return of the Stuarts.

The third section can be made to co-operate harmoniously with the first, but never with the second,—you can see that at a glance.

I have written at immoderate and immodest length: my pen ran away from me. . .

In accepting this important post I shall give all that I am and all that I can hope to be freely and joyfully to your service. You need no pledge of my loyalty both in heart and act. I should be false to myself did I not prove true to the great trust you confide to me and to your own personal and political fortunes in the present and in the future.

Your administration must be made brilliantly successful and strong in the confidence and pride of the people; not obviously directing its energies to re-elec tion, but compelling that result by the logic of events and by the imperious necessities of the situation. . .

It is this fact which has led me to the momentous conclusion embodied in this letter,—for however much I might admire you as a statesmen, I would not enter your Cabinet if I did not believe in you as a man and love you as a friend. . . .

It would be personally unpleasant and politically disastrous to have him [Conkling] in Cabinet association. . . . No Cabinet could get along with him, nor could the President himself. . . . He would insult everybody having business with his Department whom he did not happen to like, and he really happens to dislike about ninety-nine in every hundred of his acquaintances. . . . Conkling is bound to go with you anyway if your treatment of him be decent and honorable, and you will never deal otherwise with him. . . . You can always trust a man not to saw off the limb of a tree when he is on the other end. . . . I want you to remember that you are elected President of the United States, that the power of the Executive is lodged in your h nds, and that you have all the power and rights and are bound to assert and maintain all the dignity and independence of the great office. All I fear is that your instinctive generosity

will carry you beyond the limits of fair justice to yourself, and that you will err on that side. I say this because I do not want you to trust the great patronage departments where there is the remotest danger of their being used adversely to your personal interests. . . I disclaim all and every effort to force or attempt to force anybody on you, but I am awfully anxious that you shall have a true friend in the treasury. . . . I think a Western man at the head of the treasury is a *sine qua non* for your success. . . . I beg you to keep your thoughts in that direction. . . . I assume that you will give one place to New England, one place to New York, one place to Pennsylvania, and one to the South. This leaves you only three for the great West, extending from the base of the Alleghanies to the foot-hills of the Rocky Mountains. . . . The last two Southern Cabinet members came from Tennessee. Would it not be better to seek a representative from another State? The more I turn the subject over "upside down and t'other end to," the more I come to the conclusion that Wayne MacVeagh on the whole is the stronghold for Pennsylvania and for the Reformers. There is no other Cabinet stone in your hand that will kill so many political dogs at one throw. I guess you'd better fire it.—*Life, pp. 490, 491, 494, 497, 501, 502.*

Expansion, in connection with Cuba, Hawaii, etc.

The policy of this country with regard to the Pacific is the natural complement to its Atlantic policy. The history of our European relations for fity years shows the jealous concern with which the United States has guarded its control of the coast from foreign interference. Its attitude toward Cuba is in point. That rich island, the key to the Gulf of Mexico, is, though in the hands of Spain, a part of the American commercial system. My predecessor, Mr. Secretary Everett, showed that, without forcing or even coveting possession of the island, its condition was essentially an American question; that if ever ceasing to be Spanish, Cuba must necessarily become American, and not fall under any other European domination, and that the ceaseless movement of segregation of American inter-

ests from European control, and unification in a broader American sphere of independent life, could not and should not be checked. The material possession of Hawaii is not desired by the United States any more than was that of Cuba. But under no circumstances can the United States permit any change in the territorial control of either which would cut it adrift from the American system, whereto they both indispensably belong, by the operation of natural laws, and must belong by the operation of political necessity. —*Life, pp. 511, 512.*

At the close of his campaign for the presidency in 1884, he said:

I am not speaking for myself. No man ever met with a misfortune in being defeated for the presidency, while men have met great misfortunes in being elected to it. . . . I am pleading the cause of the American people. I am pleading the cause of the American farmer, the American manufacturer, the American mechanic, and the American laborer against the world. I am reproached by some excellent people for appearing before these multitudes of my countrymen upon the ground that it is inconsistent with the dignity of the office for which I am named. I do not feel it to be so. I know no reason why I should not face the American people . . . I close this canvass, Mr. Chairman, with a profound conviction that, intelligent as the voters of the United States are, accustomed as they are to give heed to the weight and tendency of the questions to be decided, the people of the United States have not yet measured, nor, as I believe, yet fully comprehended, what it would mean to transfer this government to the absolute control of the Southern States of this Union. . . . I here now repeat, that to transfer the political power of the country to the Democratic party at this time would by no means be one of those ordinary transfers of the government from one party to another which the gray-haired men within my view witnessed more than once in the last generation. It would not be merely an instance of one party going out and another coming in It would be rather a reversal and overturning of the industrial systems of the government, of the financial systems of

the government; in short, a transfer of the sovereignty of the country, of far greater consequence than the ordinary changes of dynasty which occur in European governments of a different form from ours.—*Life, pp. 579, 583.*

While secretary of state under President Harrison, he had occasion to discuss the question of the seal in the Behring Sea. In part he said:

Whence did the ships of Canada derive the right to do, in 1886, that which they refrained from doing for nearly ninety years.?

Upon what grounds did Her Majesty's government defend, in the year 1886 a course of conduct in the Behring Sea which had been carefully avoided ever since the discovery of that sea?

By what reasoning did Her Majesty's government conclude that an act may be committed with impunity against the rights of the United States which had never been attempted against the same rights, when held by the Russian Empire. . . .

To the President he wrote:

If we get up a war-cry and send naval vessels to Behring Sea it will re-elect Lord Salisbury. England always sustains an administration with the prospect of war pending. Lord Salisbury would dissolve Parliament instantly if we made a demonstration of war. On the other side I am not sure – or rather I am sure— that war would prove of no advantage to you. New York and Massachusetts are steadily against war with England unless the last point of honor requires it. Again, I think you will bitterly disappoint Lord Salisbury by keeping quiet. We would have all the fuss and there would be no war after all. Not a man in a million believes we should ultimately have war.—*Life, pp. 667, 671.*

To the delegates to the Pan-American congress, in opening the session, he said, in part:

Gentlemen of the International American Conference: Speaking for the Government of the United States, I bid you welcome to this Capital Speaking for the people of the United States, I bid you welcome to every section and to every State of the Union. You

come in response to an invitation extended by the President on the special authorization of Congress. Your presence here is no ordinary event. It signifies much to the people of all America to-day. It may signify far more in the days to come. No Conference of nations has ever assembled to consider the welfare of territorial possessions so vast and to contemplate the possibilities of a future so great and so inspiring. . . .

The aggregate territorial extent of the nations here represented falls but little short of 12,000,00 of square miles—more than three times the area of all Europe, and but little less than one-fourth part of the globe; while in respect to the power of producing the articles which are essential to human life, and those which minister to life's luxury, they constitute even a larger proportion of the entire world. Those great possessions to-day have an aggregate population approaching 120,000,000, but if peopled as densely as the average of Europe, the total number would exceed 1,000,000,000. . . .

The delegates I am addressing can do much to establish permanent relations of confidence, respect, and friendship between the nations which they represent. They can show to the world an honorable, peaceful conference of eighteen independent American Powers, in which all shall meet together on terms of absolute equality; a conference in which there can be no attempt to coerce a single delegate against his own conception of the interest of his nation; a conference which will permit no secret understanding on any subject, but will frankly publish to the world all its conclusions; a conference which will tolerate no spirit of conquest, but will aim to cultivate an American sympathy as broad as both continents. . . .

We believe that hearty co-operation, based on hearty confidence, will save all American states from the burdens and evils which have long and cruelly afflicted the older nations of the world.

We believe that a spirit of justice, of common and equal interest between the American states, will leave no room for an artificial balance of power like unto that which has led to wars abroad and drenched Europe in blood.

by other methods which it is not nec-
their desire to enter upon reciprocal
tions with the United States; the re-
press equal willingness, could they be
eir advances would be favorably con-

delay and uncertainty of treaties, it
ed that a practicable and prompt mode
estion was to submit an amendment to
f bill, authorizing the President to de-
the United States free to all the pro-
ion of the American hemisphere upon
duties are imposed, whenever and so
ion shall admit to its ports free of all
ial (State), municipal, and other taxes
and other bread-stuff, preserved
and fruits, cotton-seed oil, rice,
including all articles of food,
other articles of wood, agricul-
machinery, mining and mechan-
tural steel and iron, steel rails,
cars and supplies, street cars, and
mention these particular articles
n most frequently referred to as
aluable exchange could be readily
ould no doubt be profitably enlarged
igation of the needs and advantages
foreign markets. . .
hat in many respects the tariff bill
ate is a just measure, and that most
re in accordance with the wise policy
t there is not a section nor a line in
hat will open a market for another
another barrel of pork. If sugar is
free list without exacting important
in return, we shall close the door for
rocity against ourselves. I think you
aluable hints on this subject in the
message of June 19, with as much
as was ever stated in so short a space.
rkets for breadstuffs grows narrower.
exerting every nerve to secure her
om India, and the rapid expansion of
n Russia gives us a powerful compet-

We believe that friendship, avowed with candor and maintained with good faith, will remove from American states the necessity of guarding boundary lines between themselves with fortifications and military force.

We believe that standing armies, beyond those which are needful for public order and the safety of internal administration, should be unknown on both the American continents.

We believe that friendship and not force, the spirit of just law and not the violence of the mob, should be the recognized rule of administration between American nations and in American nations. . . .

In closing he said:

The extent and value of all that has been worthily achieved by your Conference cannot be measured today. We stand too near it. Time will define and heighten the estimate of your work; experience will confirm our present faith; final results will be your vindication and your triumph.

If, in this closing hour, the Conference had but one deed to celebrate, we should dare call the world's attention to the deliberate, confident, solemn dedication of two great Continents to Peace and to the prosperity which has Peace for its foundation. We hold up this new Magna Charta, which abolishes war and substitutes Arbitration between the American Republics, as the first and great fruit of the International American Conference. That noblest of Americans, the aged poet and philanthropist Whittier, is the first to send his salutation and his benediction, declaring: "If in the spirit of peace the American Conference agrees upon a rule of Arbitration which shall make war in this hemisphere well-nigh impossible, its sessions will prove one of the most important events in the history of the world.—*Life, pp. 677, 678, 679, 681.*

Blaine's views in regard to his plan of reciprocity, and the relation of the McKinley bill of 1890 to it, may be seen in these extracts:

Fifteen of the seventeen republics with which we have been in conference have indicated, by the votes of their representatives in the International American

Conference, and by other methods which it is not necessary to define, their desire to enter upon reciprocal commercial relations with the United States; the remaining two express equal willingness, could they be assured that their advances would be favorably considered.

To escape the delay and uncertainty of treaties, it has been suggested that a practicable and prompt mode of testing the question was to submit an amendment to the pending tariff bill, authorizing the President to declare the ports of the United States free to all the products of any nation of the American hemisphere upon which no export duties are imposed, whenever and so long as such nation shall admit to its ports free of all national, provincial (State), municipal, and other taxes our flour, cornmeal, and other bread-stuff, preserved meats, fish, vegetables, and fruits, cotton-seed oil, rice, and other provisions, including all articles of food, lumber, furniture and other articles of wood, agricultural implements and machinery, mining and mechanical machinery, structural steel and iron, steel rails, locomotives, railway cars and supplies, street cars, and refined petroleum. I mention these particular articles because they have been most frequently referred to as those with which a valuable exchange could be readily effected. The list could no doubt be profitably enlarged by a careful investigation of the needs and advantages of both the home and foreign markets. . .

I do not doubt that in many respects the tariff bill pending in the Senate is a just measure, and that most of its provisions are in accordance with the wise policy of protection. But there is not a section nor a line in the entire bill that will open a market for another bushel of wheat or another barrel of pork. If sugar is now placed on the free list without exacting important trade concessions in return, we shall close the door for a profitable reciprocity against ourselves. I think you will find some valuable hints on this subject in the President's brief message of June 19, with as much practical wisdom as was ever stated in so short a space.

Our foreign markets for breadstuffs grows narrower. Great Britain is exerting every nerve to secure her bread supplies from India, and the rapid expansion of the wheat area in Russia gives us a powerful compet-

itor in the markets of Europe. It becomes us therefore to use every opportunity for the extension of our market on both of the American continents. With nearly one hundred million dollars' worth of sugar seeking our market every year, we shall prove ourselves most unskilled legislators if we do not secure a large field for the sale and consumption of our breadstuffs and provisions. The late conference of American republics proved the existence of a common desire for closer relations. Our Congress should take up the work where the International Conference left it. Our field of commercial development and progress lies south of us.—*Life, pp. 684, 686, 687.*

Again, regarding expansion, into the islands of the sea:

In regard to the purchase of the Danish colonies, St. George and St. Lucia, my prepossessions are all against it until we are by fate in possession of the larger West Indies. They are very small, of no great commercial value, and in case of war would require us to defend them, and to defend them at a great cost. At the same time they lack strategic value. They are destined to become ours, but among the last of the West Indies that will be taken. . . .

I think there are only three places that are of value enough to be taken that are not continental. One is Hawaii, and the others are Cuba and Porto Rico. Cuba and Porto Rico are not imminent, and will not be for a generation. Hawaii may come up for decision at any unexpected hour, and I hope we shall be prepared to decide it in the affirmative.—*Life, p. 692.*

Concerning reciprocity with Canada September 23, 1891, Blaine wrote to President Harrison:

It is of the highest possible importance in my view that there be no treaty of reciprocity (with Canada).

. . .

I think it would be one of the worst things among the farmers in a political point of view we could do, and we cannot afford to lose a vote now until after the presidential election. They have got it into their heads that we did something for them in the McKinley

tariff, and giving away natural products by reciprocity would end the whole matter. It would be considered a betrayal of the agricultural interests. The fact is we do not want any intercourse with Canada except through the medium of a tariff, and she will find that she has a hard row to hoe and will ultimately, I believe, seek admission to the Union.

The poor showing that Canada made in the late census was a revelation to the Canadians themselves and if we do not grant them reciprocity they will make a poorer showing ten years hence. We are tending to have the great majority of the farmers with us. Let us encourage them by every means we can use and not discourage them by anything. We will break the alliance before six months if we steadily maintain this policy.—*Life, pp. 693, 694.*

QUESTIONS

(1) Blaine's characteristics as a young man. (2) What was his standing as a student? (3) What was his first occupation? (4) Trace his changes of residence. (5) Did he have early political aspirations? (6) To what parties did he belong? (7) What did he think of military men as presidential candidates? (8) What was his first national political work? (9) When did he begin his congressional career? (10) How did he stand toward Lincoln's administration?

(1) What amendment in regard to finances did he wish to have made to the constitution? (2) What prediction did he make in regard to governmental revenues? (3) What his views in regard to a standing army? (4) Outline his views regarding the questions that arose in connection with the election of 1876.

(1) What do you think of his argument to the Irish voters? (2) Was his letter to Garfield in 1881 that of a skilled politician? (3) Does history justify his positions? (4) Is it an egotistical letter? (5) What his personal feelings toward Conkling? (6) What advice does he give Garfield? (7) Was it wise? (8) Bring together all he said on expansion. (9) What conclusion in regard to his position on the subject? What position did he take in regard to a presidential candidate taking part in a campaign?

(1) Outline Blaine's position and arguments in regard to the seal fisheries and the Behring Sea discussion. (2) What plans did he have in regard to our relations to the South American countries? (3) What did he think of the tariff bill of 1890? (4) What relations in his judgment should prevail between Canada and the United States.

(1) Compare Blaine and Clay. (2) Note changes in character of questions discussed by Adams, for example, and Blaine. (3) Compare the two men. (4) Judge by the extracts given, what man do you consider the greatest? (5) Which do you admire most? (6) Which was the greatest orator? (7) Which the ablest statesman? (8) Which the purest statesman?

CHRONOLOGY

1492. Discovery of America.
1497. The Cabots on the coast of North America.
1513. Florida discovered. The Pacific Ocean first seen.
1519-22. First circumnavigation of the world.
1519-21. The Mississippi discovered by De Soto.
1565. Florida settled by Spaniards.
1584-87. Sir Walter Raleigh's attempt at colonization.
1607. Jamestown settled. Captain John Smith.
1608. Quebec founded by French.
1609. Hudson river discovered by Dutch.
1619. House of Burgesses. Slaves introduced into Virginia.
1620. Pilgrims land at Plymouth.
1630. Boston founded.
1634. Maryland settled. Religious toleration.
1636. Harvard college founded. Roger Williams settles Rhode Island. Pequod war.
1638. New Haven founded; Swedes settled Delaware.
1639. First written Constitution—"Fundamental Orders" of Connecticut.
1643. New England Confederacy.
1656-61. Persecution of Quakers in Massachusetts.
1664. New York captured by the English.
1665. English settle New Jersey.
1675. King Philip's war.
1676. Bacon's rebellion.
1682. Pennsylvania founded by Penn.
1691. Massachusetts New Charter. Leisler executed.
1692. William and Mary College founded. Witchcraft delusion.
1701. Yale College founded.
1704. Boston News Letter—First American newspaper.
1718. New Orleans founded by the French.
1733. Oglethorpe founds Savannah, Ga.
1746. College of New Jersey, Princeton founded.
1749. University of Pennsylvania founded.
1754. Albany convention.
1754-63. French and Indian war.
1759. Wolfe takes Quebec.
1763. Peace of Paris; Canada gained by English. Mason and Dixon's Line.

1765. Stamp Act Congress; Patrick Henry's resolutions; "Sons of Liberty."
1766. Repeal of Stamp Act; The Declaratory Act.
1767. Townshend Revenue Act; Dickinson's Farmer's Letters.
1768. British Troops in Boston.
1770. Repeal Townshend Act. "Boston Massacre."
1771. Tryon's war in North Carolina.
1772. The "Gaspee" burned; Committees of Correspondence in Massachusetts.
1773. Boston "Tea Party;" Intercolonial Committees of Correspondence.
1774. Boston Port Bill; Massachusetts Charter Bill; Quartering Troops; Quebec Act; First Continental Congress.
1775. War begins; Lexington; Ticonderoga. Second Continental Congress. Washington, Commander-in-Chief; Bunker Hill.
1776. Declaration of Independence; Boston evacuated; Americans defeated at New York and in New Jersey; Trenton; "Common Sense" by Thos. Paine.
1777. Surrender of Burgoyne; Articles of Confederation sent to the States; "Valley Forge."
1778. France makes treaty with States. George Rogers Clark in Illinois, etc.
1779. War in South.
1780. War in South; Arnold's treason; André; Gen. Green.
1781. Cornwallis surrenders. Robert Morris head of finances. Confederacy completed. Bank of North America.
1783. Treaty of peace.
1784. First Ordinance for Northwest Territory.
1785. Maryland and Virginia Commissions meet.
1786. Annapolis Convention.
1787. Constitutional Convention. "Ordinance of 1787."
1788. Constitution ratified by ten states.
1789. Government under the new Constitution begun; Washington President. North Carolina ratifies the Constitution.
1790. Rhode Island accepts the Constitution.
1791. Ten Amendments adopted. Bank chartered. Parties formed. Kentucky a State. Assumption.
1792. Columbia river discovered. French Republic established. Vermont a State.
1793. Genet and neutrality. Cotton gin. Fugitive Slave Law.
1794. Whiskey Insurrection. Jay's Treaty.
1795. Excitement over Jay Treaty; Treaty with Spain.

1796. "Posts" delivered. Washington's Farewell Address. Tennessee a State.
1797. John Adams President.
1798. X. Y. Z. affair; Alien Laws; Sedition Law; Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions.
1799. Kentucky Resolutions. Army Intrigue. Washington dies.
1800. Treaty with France. Washington City becomes the Capitol. Jefferson-Burr contest.
1801. Jefferson President.
1802. Ohio a State.
1803. Louisiana purchase.
1804. Lewis and Clark expedition. XII Amendment.
1805-6. The Burr Conspiracy.
1806. Orders in Council. Berlin Decree.
1807. "Chesapeake" and "Leopard." Embargo.
1808. Slave trade illegal.
1809. Non-Intercourse substituted for Embargo. Madison President.
1810. "Macon Bill No. I."
1811. "Tippecanoe."
1812. War declared. Louisiana a State.
1813. War; Perry's Victory.
1814. The Hartford Convention. Washington burned. Treaty of Peace signed.
1815. January 4, the Hartford Convention adjourned. January 8, Jackson's victory at New Orleans. Unitarian secession from Congregational Church.
1816. Second National Bank chartered. Dallas' report on manufactures. Tariff act passed; generally regarded as the first protective tariff. American "Colonization Society" founded. Caucus system for nominating presidential candidates breaking down. National debt, $127,335,000. Calhoun's "bank bonus bill" for internal improvements introduced. Monroe elected President and Tompkins Vice-President, by 183 electoral votes, to 34 for King. Indiana admitted as a state.
1817. Monroe's tour through New England and the West. All internal taxes repealed. Specie payments resumed. The Seminole War in Florida begins. Madison vetoes an internal improvement bill. Mississippi admitted as a state. The "Savannah" the first steamship to cross the Atlantic.
1817-20. Old party names pass out of use. Local issues take the place of national. Speculation, followed by the first great crisis.
1818. Connecticut adopts a new constitution. Jackson invades Florida. Hangs Ambrister and Arbuthnot; thus involves the United States

with England. Clay attacks Jackson in Congress. Increase of tariff on iron. Treaty with Great Britain. Fisheries, boundary, Oregon and commercial questions provided for. Illinois admitted as a state.

1819. Florida bought from Spain for $5,000,000. Struggle over the admission of Missouri begins. Arkansas organized as a Territory, with slavery. The crisis of 1819-21 begins. The National bank investigated. Specie payments again suspended, except in New England. The Supreme Court in McCullough vs. Maryland decides the National Bank law constitutional. The famous Dartmouth College case, and Webster's plea; held that Charters are contracts. An act against the slave trade. Alabama admitted as a state. University of Virginia chartered.

1820. The slave trade declared piracy. Liberia founded. The first(?) Missouri compromise. In Louisiana territory slavery to be forbidden north of latitude 36° 30′. Missouri enabling act passed. A constitution to be formed with or without slavery as its people wished. Monroe re-elected President and only one opposing vote. Maine admitted as a state. Population, U. S. 9,633,822.

(1) Free States, 5,132,000; (2) Slave States, 4,522,000.

Representatives in Congress: (1) Free States, 133; (2) Slave States, 90.

1821. The second (?) Missouri compromise, Clay's. Missouri admitted as a state. The Florida treaty ratified by Spain. New York forms a new constitution; extends suffrage. Intrigues for presidency, in 1824, begin. Crawford and Adams most prominent candidates. Jackon governor of Florida.

1822. Monroe vetoes the Cumberland road bill. Jackson comes forward as a presidential candidate.

1818-22. The independence of the Spanish-American states recognized by the United States.

1823. The so-called Monroe doctrine set forth. The "Holy Alliance" baffled in its American plans. Monroe's letter against the internal improvement plans and ideas of the times.

1824. The tariff rates increased; protection extended. The great Webster-Clay debate over protection. The last Congressional caucus to nominate presidential candidates. Crawford nominated for President by the caucus; Adams, Clay and Jackson by the

state legislatures. Pennsylvania suggests a national nominating convention. Not carried out till 1831. Lafayette visits America. No choice by electors for president.
(1) Jackson, 99; (2) Adams, 84; (3) Crawford, 41; (4) Clay, 37.

1825. In Congress Clay's followers support Adams.
(1) Adams, 13 states; (2) Jackson, 7 states; (3) Crawford, 4 states.
Cry of "bargain and sale" raised. University of Virginia opened. Clay becomes Secretary of State. Adams urges internal improvements and a national university. The Erie canal opened. Webster's "Bunker Hill" oration. The Panama Congress. Clay's "Human Freedom League" to oppose the "Holy Alliance" proposed.

1826. Duel between Clay and Randolph. Trouble with Creek Indians in Georgia. July 4, Adams and Jefferson die. American Temperance Society at Boston.

1827. Congress in opposition to President Adams. Difficulties with England settled by Gallatin.

1828. Candidates for presidency nominated by state legislatures and mass conventions. The "tariff of abominations." Webster this year, for the first time, supports protection. The triumph of "the people" in the election of Jackson. Anti-Mason excitement. The disappearance of Morgan. South Carolina dissatisfied with the tariff law.

1829. Jackson's inauguration; popular demonstration. Jackson and Biddle begin the bank struggle. The "Kitchen cabinet." The "spoils system" introduced into national politics. The real beginning of railroads in the United States.

1830. The Maysville road veto by Jackson. The tariff bill modified; protection retained. Webster-Hayne debate. Nullification doctrine set forth. B. & O. railroad opened. Population 12,866,020.

1831. Jackson reorganizes his cabinet, and breaks with Calhoun. The Seminole controversy. The Nat Turner insurrection in Virginia. Abolition societies organized. The first national nominating convention. Garrison begins the "Liberator."

1832. The bank veto. Monopoly denounced. Jackson re-elected. Tariff act; again protection sustained. The Anti-Masons enter national politics. The first one-idea party. Nullification ordinance by South Carolina. Jackson

issues his proclamation against nullification. Charles Carroll, the last of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, dies.

1833. The "force bill". Clay's compromise tariff bill. South Carolina withdraws her nullification act. The Webster-Calhoun debate. Jackson at his zenith. October 1, "removal of the deposits." Clay's land distribution bill vetoed. National abolition society organized.

1834. "Censure" of the president by the senate. The hard-money struggle; Benton. The Whig party formed and named. McCormick's reaping machine patented.

1835. Mob spirit everywhere; especially against abolitionists and catholics. National debt paid off. The "loco-focos." Prudence Crandall's school for colored girls closed. Struggle over "incendiary matter" in the mails. Indians of Georgia removed to Indian Territory.

1836. "Gag" resolutions in Congress against reception of "abolition" petitions. J. Q. Adams begins his great struggle for the "right of petition." Bill for "distribution of the surplus" $36,000,000, among the states. July 4, death of Madison. Van Buren elected president. Texas wins the victory of San Jacinto. The "specie circular" issued. Arkansas admitted as a state.

1837. The "expunging resolutions" adopted. Texas independence recognized. The United States presses for a settlement of her "claims" against Mexico. The great crisis and panic, speculation collapses. Van Buren for the "independent" or "sub-treasury." E. P. Lovejoy murdered. First proposal to annex Texas. Michigan admitted as a State.

1838. Continued troubles on the Canadian frontier. Smithsonian Institution founded.

1839. Trouble in organizing the House. The New Jersey seats. The "Amistad" case. The Daguerreotype first used in the United States.

1835-42. Era of "isms." Fourierism, homœopathy, hydropathy, the Graham diet, phrenology, etc. Transcendentalism, Emerson, Thoreau, Margaret Fuller, Hawthorne, etc.

1840. The "Tippecanoe and Tyler too" campaign. Election of Harrison, on "hard cider and log-cabin cry." Sub-treasury act passed. The Liberty party first appears in a national contest. Population, 17,069,453.

1830-40. A real American literature beginning to appear. Cheap newspapers, the Sun, 1833; the Herald, 1835; the Tribune, 1841, etc.

1841. Utter collapse of the "Second National Bank" and President Harrison's death. Sub-treasury act repealed. Clay and Tyler in opposition. Tyler and his cabinet quarrel over Tyler's bank vetoes.

1842. The Ashburton-Webster treaty. Protective tariff law enacted. State debts repudiated. Dickens visits America. The Dorr rebellion in Rhode Island. Dr. Whitman travels on horseback from Oregon to St. Louis.

1843. Webster resigns as Secretary of State.

1844. Treaty of Annexation with Texas, rejected by the Senate. Clay defeated by Polk for president. The telegraph first used, Baltimore to Washington. The Democratic campaign cry, "54° 40′ or fight."

1845. Joint resolution for annexing Texas. Polk's four great measures announced to Bancroft; Tariff reduction, acquisition of California, the independent or sub-treasury restored, Oregon boundary settled; all accomplished. Florida admitted as a state. Texas admitted as a state.

1846. The independent treasury act passed. The Oregon boundary line settled. A treaty with Great Britain. California and New Mexico seized. The so-called free-trade tariff passed. The "Wilmot-Proviso" proposed. Howe invents the sewing machine. Iowa admitted as a state.

1847. Victories over Mexico. Renown of Taylor and Scott. Lincoln first appears in national politics. Douglas' first term in the Senate.

1848. Taylor elected over Cass. The "Free-Soil" movement; Van Buren its candidate. Treaty of Guadaloupe Hidalgo. February 23, J. Q. Adams dies. Calhoun asserts right of slaveholder to take his slave into any territory of the United States. Discovery of gold in California. The Mormons emigrate to Utah. Wisconsin admitted as a state.

1849. Struggle in Congress continues over organization of the territories. Rush to gold fields of California.

1850. Webster's "7th of March" speech. Seward's "Higher Law" speech, March 11. Clay's compromise adopted. California a free state. Slave trade in District of Columbia to end. Texas boundary settled. Texas paid $10,000,000. Utah and New Mexico territories with-

out specification as regards slavery. Fugitive slave law. The Clayton-Bulwer treaty. Death of President Taylor. Fugitive slave excitement begins. Population, 23,191,876.

1851. "Filibusterers" invade Cuba. Letter postage reduced to three cents. Disunion threatened. Visit of Kossuth. Webster's Hulseman letter. Maine liquor law.

1852. Scott and Pierce. The "Tweedle-Dee and and Tweedle-Dum" campaign. Scott carried only four states, Kentucky and Tennessee, Massachusetts and Vermont. Clay and Webster die. "Uncle Tom's Cabin."

1853. The Koszta difficulty. The Gadsden purchase.

1854. The Kansas-Nebraska bill. Douglas urges his "popular sovereignty" doctrine. "Fillibustering" against Cuba. The Know-Nothings come into being. The Republican party organized. The "Ostend Manifesto." The struggle begins in Kansas. Treaty with Japan.

1855. Personal liberty laws in northern states. The "New England Colonization" society. Missouri invades Kansas. Banks elected speaker of the House.

1856. Wm. Walker in Nicaragua. Sumner assaulted by Brooks. Whigs and Americans nominate Fillmore. Republicans nominate Fremont. Democrats nominate and elect Buchanan. The first geographical party campaign. Sack of Lawrence, Kansas. Threats of disunion should Fremont be elected.

1857. March 6, the Dred Scott Decision. The Lecompton constitution. Douglas breaks with Buchanan. The new Tariff Act. Duties lowered. The panic and crisis.

1858. Rebellion in Utah. Atlantic Cable laid. The Lincoln-Douglas debate. Seward's "irrepressible conflict" speech at Rochester. Minnesota admitted as a state.

1859. John Brown invades Virginia. Election of Speaker. Helper's "Impending Crisis." Great Excitement in Congress. Oregon admitted as a state.

1860. Lincoln and the Republicans. No slave extension. Douglas and "Popular Sovereignty" Democrats. Bell and the "Union." Breckenridge and slave extension. Secession ordinance passed by South Carolina. Various plans for compromise. J. J. Crittenden. Population, 31,443,321.

1861. The Peace Conference; all plans fail. Davis elected President of the Southern Confed-